Calendar No. 248

99TH CONGRESS } SENATE { REPORT
1st Session } { 99-110

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1986

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 16), 1985.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2959]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2959) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

AMOUNT IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1986

Amount of bill as passed by the House	$15,272,935,000
Budget estimates considered by House	15,280,010,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	15,280,010,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	15,182,422,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the budget estimate, 1986	−97,588,000
Under the House-passed bill	−90,513,000

S183-6.

CONTENTS

TITLE I

	Page
Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:	
Corps of Engineers—Civil:	
Construction, general	26
Flood control and coastal emergencies	42
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	43
General expenses	72
General investigations	7
Operation and maintenance, general	50
Revolving fund	72

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:	
Bureau of Reclamation:	
Construction Program	82
Emergency fund	97
General administrative expenses	97
General investigations	73
Loan Program	92
Operation and maintenance	92

TITLE III

Department of Energy:	
Atomic energy defense activities	164
Departmental administration	203
Energy supply, research and development activities	99
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	218
General science and research activities	157
Geothermal Resources Development Fund	221
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	164
Power marketing administrations:	
Alaska Power Administration	213
Bonneville Power Administration	213
Southeastern Power Administration	216
Southwestern Power Administration	216
Western Area Power Administration	217
Uranium supply and enrichment activities	150

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:	
Appalachian Regional Commission	222
Delaware River Basin Commission	223
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	223
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	224
Susquehanna River Basin Commission	224
Tennessee Valley Authority	225

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1986 beginning October 1, 1985 and ending September 30, 1986 for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy (except for fossil fuel programs, and certain conservation and regulatory programs) in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian Regional Development Programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 1986 budget estimates for this bill totals $15,280,010,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $15,182,422,000. This is a decrease of $97,588,000 below the budget estimates and $90,513,000 below the House bill.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $7,623,300,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Testing	$618,600,000
Research and development	1,219,650,000
Production and surveillance	2,424,750,000
Nuclear materials production	1,861,200,000
Defense waste management	666,000,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $1,879,721,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar energy	$161,732,000
Geothermal energy	27,200,000
Nuclear fission	631,925,000
Magnetic fusion	382,000,000
Environmental	189,300,000
Basic energy sciences	438,300,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $679,400,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$520,100,000
Nuclear physics	172,900,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $687,229,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs and activities include:

Appalachian regional development programs	$71,800,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	95,568,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	429,000,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	90,861,000

Water Resources Development

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $3,458,949,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the areas of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Water is our Nation's most precious and valuable resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy. There is only so much water available. Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

While many areas of the country suffer from severe shortages of water, others suffer from the other extreme—an excess of water which threatens both rural and urban areas with floods. Because water is a national asset, and because the availability or control of water affects and benefits all States and jurisdictions, the Federal Government has historically assumed much of the responsibility for financing of water resources development.

The existing national water resource infrastructure in America is an impressive system of dams, locks, harbors, canals, irrigation systems, reservoirs, and recreation sites with one central purpose—to serve the public's needs.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient and economical transportation of fuels for energy generation and agricultural production, and for making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

Reservoir projects provide for hydroelectric power generation and downstream flood protection, make available recreational opportunities for millions of urban and rural residents, enhance fish and wildlife habitat and provide our communities and industries with abundant and clean water supplies which are essential not only to life itself, but also to help maintain a high standard of living for the American people.

America's western framework of dams, acqueducts, and irrigation canals provides a reliable supply of quality water to over 10 million acres of land, turning once-barren deserts into some of the most agriculturally productive lands in the world. Crop production on these lands exceeds $6,000,000,000 annually and creates hundreds of thousands of jobs. In addition, related economic activity is increased. The goods and services used by farmers support a healthy regional economy which, in turn, contributes significantly to a strong national economy.

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development.

BENEFITS TO THE NATION

Benefits provided by projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are typical of such investments. For example, flood control projects have prevented almost $150,000,000,000 in damages based on an investment of $20,000,000,000, and virtually all of these projects will continue to provide increasing benefits in the years to come. The following indicates the types and magnitude of benefits provided by water resource projects:

Corps of Engineers flood control projects that cost $19,500,000,000 have prevented flood damage losses in excess of $146,000,000,000 through fiscal year 1984;

Navigation facilities constructed and operated by the Corps carried 1,777,000,000 tons of cargo in 1982;

Corps of Engineers facilities provide storage for 2,500 billion gallons of water for water supply purposes;

Corps facilities which generated 88.2 billion kilowatt hours of electricity in fiscal year 1983 have produced $4,400,000,000 in revenues through fiscal year 1983; and

Corps facilities provided 481 million recreation days in 1983.

The benefits provided by Bureau of Reclamation projects through 1983 include:

Full irrigation service to 5,097,000 acres, and a supplemental water supply to 6,804,000 acres. The gross value of crops produced on reclamation project lands in 1983 was $7,000,000,000.

An investment of $943,000,000 has provided cumulative flood control benefits of over $2,400,000,000.

Delivered 995 billion gallons of municipal, industrial, and nonagricultural water to 22 million people.

Generated 12.7 million kilowatts of hydroelectric power for a gross income in 1983 of $432,000,000.

Reclamation facilities provided 44 million recreation days at 291 Bureau recreation areas in 1983.

Major activities related to water resources development include:

Corps of Engineers—Civil:	
General investigations	$126,992,000
Construction activities	1,043,241,000
Operations and maintenance activities	1,407,795,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
General investigations	32,150,000
Construction activities	512,730,000
Operations and maintenance activities	132,665,000
Tennessee Valley Authority:	
Capital investment	20,535,000
Operating expenses	70,326,000

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held 10 sessions of hearings in connection with the fiscal year 1986 appropriation bill. The Committee has received testimony from the executive branch, numerous Members of the House and Senate, several Governors, other State and local elected officials, and private citizens. The recommendations for 1986 have, therefore, been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present, on July 23, 1985, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on July 25, 1985, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1985	$139,200,000
Budget estimate, 1986	119,000,000
House allowance	133,189,000
Committee recommendation	120,697,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+1,697,000
House allowance	−12,492,000

An appropriation of $120,697,000 is recommended by the Committee, which is $12,492,000 below the House allowance and $17,303,000 below the current level of funding.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and planning activities are shown in the following table, with Committee comments following immediately after the tabulation.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	ALABAMA								
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE	259,000	80,000	66,000	---	104,000	---	66,000	---
(FDP)	VALLEY CREEK, WARRIOR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	475,000	160,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM (CP&E)	3,350,000	2,750,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
	ALASKA								
(FC)	BETHEL BANK STABILIZATION (CP&E)	550,000	335,000	215,000	---	215,000	---	215,000	---
(FDP)	GALENA BANK STABILIZATION	367,000	95,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	HOMER SPIT EROSION	680,000	385,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	RIVERS AND HARBORS	9,620,000	2,911,000	1,096,000	---	1,096,000	---	1,096,000	---
(N)	SOUTHCENTRAL DEEP-DRAFT NAVIGATION	2,015,000	1,497,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ARIZONA								
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AZ & NM	4,945,000	4,000,000	225,000	---	375,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NOGALES WASH	585,000	205,000	235,000	---	235,000	---	235,000	---
(FDP)	PHOENIX METRO AREA (OLD CROSS CUT CANAL)	3,722,000	435,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
	ARKANSAS								
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, AR & OK	1,256,000	310,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	CLARKSVILLE	1,025,000	388,000	267,000	---	267,000	---	267,000	---
(FC)	FOURCHE BAYOU IN THE VICINITY OF LITTLE ROCK (CP&E)	1,675,000	1,361,000	314,000	---	314,000	---	314,000	---
(FDP)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, AR & LA	8,370,000	7,207,000	736,000	---	736,000	---	736,000	---
(COMP)	WHITE RIVER BASIN AUTHORIZATION REPORT, AR & MO	895,000	400,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	CALIFORNIA								
(FDP)	ANTELOPE VALLEY	1,000,000	785,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	260,000	---
(FC)	CACHE CREEK BASIN (CP&E)	2,300,000	870,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	CALIENTE CREEK STREAM GROUP	1,700,000	300,000	140,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	CALLEGUAS CREEK	1,800,000	645,000	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---
(SPEC)	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, STORM AND TIDAL WAVES	7,600,000	2,875,000	750,000	---	1,500,000	---	750,000	---
(FDP)	GUADALUPE RIVER AND ADJACENT STREAMS (CP&E)	2,424,000	2,134,000	135,000	---	400,000	---	135,000	---
(FDP)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW	4,510,000	3,464,000	370,000	---	370,000	---	500,000	---
(N)	LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBORS (INCL SAN PEDRO MODEL) (CP&E)	6,612,000	6,691,000	---	---	1,000,000	---	---	---
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM (CP&E)	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, DRY CREEK	825,000	300,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	OAKLAND INNER HARBOR (CP&E)	660,000	25,000	380,000	---	380,000	---	380,000	---
(N)	OAKLAND OUTER HARBOR (CP&E)	435,000	280,000	155,000	---	155,000	---	155,000	---
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEKS (CP&E)	3,425,000	2,790,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
(N)	REDONDO BEACH (KING HARBOR)	720,000	364,000	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR (CP&E)	625,000	100,000	525,000	---	525,000	---	525,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA (IN-DEPTH)	3,210,000	2,699,000	132,000	---	132,000	---	132,000	---
(FDP)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY SHORELINE	3,780,000	2,125,000	520,000	---	520,000	---	520,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN (COMP)	4,415,000	4,305,000	110,000	---	---	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER BASIN	100,000	---	---	---	285,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER BASIN	250,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	960,000	705,000	255,000	---	255,000	---	255,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN & ORANGE COUNTY	9,430,000	7,194,000	350,000	---	650,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER (PHASE 1) (CP&E)	17,000,000	11,155,000	4,000,000	---	---	---	4,000,000	---
(SP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY (BEACH EROSION)	320,000	150,000	---	---	79,000	---	---	---
(N)	SUNSET HARBOR	820,000	696,000	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(N)	VENTURA MARINA	625,000	125,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	WALNUT CREEK BASIN (CP&E)	1,059,000	270,000	185,000	---	185,000	---	185,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	COLORADO								
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER ABOVE JOHN MARTIN DAM	5,200,000	1,919,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBS - NORTH OF PUEBLO	808,000	265,000	185,000	---	185,000	---	185,000	---
(FDP)	PLATTE RIVER BASIN, CO, NE, WY	200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	WESTERLY CREEK (CP&E)	478,000	---	---	---	365,000	---	---	---
	COMM N. MARIANAS								
(N)	NORTHERN MARIANAS ISLANDS (COMPREHENSIVE)	840,000	355,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	CONNECTICUT								
(COMP)	CONN RVR BSN, AUTH REPORTS, CT, MA, NH & VT	4,490,000	2,622,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(COMP)	LONG ISLAND SOUND-AUTHORIZATION REPORTS, CT & RI	440,000	260,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	DIST OF COLUMBIA								
(FDP)	WASHINGTON, D.C. & VICINITY (AE&D)	---	---	---	---	---	360,000	---	---
	FLORIDA								
(FDP)	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA WATER SUPPLY	2,697,000	2,327,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	CLEARWATER SPOIL DISPOSAL	236,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA EROSION & STORM EFFECTS STUDY	5,550,000	250,000	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
(N)	ESCAMBIA RIVER	343,000	110,000	83,000	---	83,000	---	83,000	---
(N)	FT. PIERCE HARBOR (CP&E)	200,000	20,000	---	---	180,000	---	---	---
(N)	HUDSON RIVER (REVIEW OF DEFERRED PROJECT)	75,000	---	---	---	75,000	---	---	---
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, ST. JOHNS RIVER, & INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY MOD	140,000	---	---	---	140,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(SPEC)	JACKSONVILLE METROPOLITAN PARK	100,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	750,000	571,000	179,000	---	179,000	---	179,000	---
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR	183,000	100,000	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES	---	---	---	---	---	---	45,000	---
(BE)	MONROE COUNTY BEACHES	---	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	ST. JOHN'S RIVER	1,319,000	100,000	---	---	220,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ST. MARYS RIVER BASIN, FL & GA	1,324,000	400,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR BRANCH CHANNELS (AEID)	50,200,000	510,000	---	465,000	---	465,000	---	465,000
	GEORGIA								
(COMP)	METRO ATLANTA WATER RESOURCES MGT. (CPIE)	---	---	---	---	---	---	650,000	---
(N)	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	2,268,000	250,000	479,000	---	479,000	---	479,000	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR	960,000	150,000	210,000	---	210,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	DALTON LAKE (PHASE I)	2,428,000	1,421,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHEAST GEORGIA REGION	1,386,000	1,012,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR COMPREHENSIVE	2,334,000	2,134,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA, SC & NC	1,885,000	1,234,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN AT OATES CREEK (CPIE)	780,000	530,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH METROPOLITAN ATLANTA REGION	1,057,000	300,000	157,000	---	157,000	---	157,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK	150,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
	GUAM								
(N)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN TERRITORY OF GUAM	3,478,000	3,072,000	196,000	---	196,000	---	196,000	---
	HAWAII								
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII - SO. KOHALA WATER SUPPLY	225,000	150,000	73,000	---	73,000	---	73,000	---
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII	3,329,000	3,411,000	98,000	---	98,000	---	98,000	---
(FDP)	WAILUKU - HOWOLII HYDRO	413,000	240,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	IDAHO								
(FDP)	COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID, MT, OR, WA & WY...	22,122,000	15,527,000	1,752,000	---	1,752,000	---	1,752,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER SNAKE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID & WY.....	8,283,000	4,968,000	1,147,000	---	1,147,000	---	1,147,000	---
	ILLINOIS								
(FDP)	CHICAGO - SOUTH END OF LAKE MICHIGAN IN & IL.....	4,907,000	3,665,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES.....	1,400,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CHICAGOLAND UNDERFLOW PLAN, PHASE 1 DMM.....	9,628,000	9,289,000	371,000	---	371,000	---	371,000	---
(SP)	ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK.....	356,000	296,000	---	---	60,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ILLINOIS RIVER BETWEEN HENRY AND NAPLES.....	757,000	375,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(SP)	ILLINOIS SHORELINE EROSION.....	1,645,000	449,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	LOVES PARK (CP&E).....	1,505,000	200,000	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FDP)	MACKINAW RIVER.....	662,000	205,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, PHASE I (CP&E).....	805,000	425,000	380,000	---	380,000	---	380,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH QUINCY (CP&E).....	470,000	150,000	320,000	---	320,000	---	320,000	---
(FDP)	VERMILION RIVER.....	555,000	310,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
	INDIANA								
(FDP)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA.....	765,000	430,000	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, PHASE I (CP&E).....	1,358,000	677,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(COMP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE.....	600,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	IOWA								
(FC)	PERRY CREEK (CP&E).....	520,000	385,000	135,000	---	135,000	---	135,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	KANSAS								
(FDP)	ARK R & TRIBS, GREAT BEND, KS TO TULSA (REMAINING)...	7,200,000	4,783,000	535,000	---	535,000	---	535,000	---
(FDP)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KS & MO...	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	DOUGLASS LAKE (AEIB)...	83,500,000	165,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	GRAND NEOSHO RIVER, KS & OK...	3,550,000	574,000	276,000	---	276,000	---	276,000	---
(FDP)	GREAT BEND, KAN...	1,260,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	800,000
(FDP)	KANSAS AND OSAGE RIVERS...	5,745,000	5,460,000	285,000	---	285,000	---	285,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN KS & MO...	300,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	VERDIGRIS RIVER, KS & OK (REMAINING)...	3,535,000	3,465,000	70,000	---	70,000	---	70,000	---
(FDP)	WINFIELD (REVIEW)...	560,000	320,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	KENTUCKY								
(N)	BIG SANDY RIVER, KY, WV & VA...	3,912,000	2,827,000	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---
(N)	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY,GA,AL,MS,NC,TN & VA...	6,892,000	2,500,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES...	2,897,000	2,187,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM, PA,IL,IN,OH, & WV...	14,020,000	7,124,000	2,575,000	---	2,575,000	---	2,575,000	---
(FDP)	TRADEWATER RIVER BASIN...	850,000	300,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY & TN...	2,412,000	1,362,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	LOUISIANA								
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES...	2,100,000	750,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE - JUMP WATERWAY...	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION...	4,240,000	2,393,000	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
(FDP)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN - WEST SHORE...	1,040,000	130,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - WATER SUPPLY...	2,213,000	626,000	262,000	---	262,000	---	262,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA SHORE & BARRIER ISLAND EROSION	1,650,000	500,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SPEC)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - LAND LOSS AND MARSH CREATION	1,493,000	566,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	MERM, VERM & CALCASIEU RIVERS & BAYOU TECHE	4,915,000	2,253,000	160,000	---	280,000	---	280,000	---
(M)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE (CP&E)	6,900,000	4,645,000	1,255,000	---	1,255,000	---	1,255,000	---
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SLIDELL (CP&E)	---	---	---	---	1,470,000	---	1,470,000	---
(COMP)	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LA, AR, OK & TX (AUTH RPTS)	1,959,000	1,403,000	221,000	---	221,000	---	221,000	---
	MAINE								
(M)	FORE RIVER CHANNEL, PORTLAND HARBOR	555,000	230,000	73,000	---	73,000	---	73,000	---
(FDP)	SAINT JOHN RIVER	3,810,000	1,870,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	MARYLAND								
(SP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY, (SHORELINE EROSION) MD & VA	2,000,000	500,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	900,000	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA-YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, MD, PA & WV	8,733,000	5,922,000	250,000	---	750,000	---	250,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS								
(M)	BOSTON HARBOR	725,000	455,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	MASSACHUSETTS COASTAL, ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE (CP&E)	900,000	305,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(COMP)	SOUTHEASTERN NEW ENG AUTH, REPORTS, MA, RI & CT	2,400,000	1,864,000	228,000	---	228,000	---	228,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	MICHIGAN								
(FDP)	GREAT LAKES PARTICULARLY LAKE ONTARIO & LAKE ERIE.....	9,862,000	9,108,000	320,000	---	320,000	---	320,000	---
(N)	MONROE HARBOR (CP&E).....	2,000,000	600,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FDP)	SAGINAW RIVER.....	3,791,000	922,000	158,000	---	218,000	---	158,000	---
(FC)	SAGINAW RIVER, VASSER UNIT (AE&D).....	---	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---
	MINNESOTA								
(FC)	EAST GRAND FORKS (AE&D).....	22,500,000	1,111,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY.....	6,730,000	4,528,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MN & ND.....	8,770,000	7,761,000	560,000	---	560,000	---	560,000	---
(FDP)	ST. CROIX RIVER, MN & WI.....	1,146,000	895,000	199,000	---	199,000	---	199,000	---
(FC)	TWIN VALLEY LAKE, WILD RICE RIVER (AE&D).....	29,700,000	1,942,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
	MISSISSIPPI								
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI GULF COASTAL AREAS.....	1,255,000	300,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	PEARL RIVER BASIN, SHOCCOE DAM (CP&E),MS & LA.....	8,410,000	6,256,000	1,170,000	---	1,170,000	---	1,920,000	---
(SPEC)	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY SPECIAL STUDY, MS, AL, TN & KY.....	6,333,000	6,083,000	---	---	---	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL.....	2,840,000	682,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	YAZOO RIVER (AE&D).....	225,000,000	2,135,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
	MISSOURI								
(FC)	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY (CP&E).....	750,000	---	---	---	350,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	CREVE COEUR CREEK (INTERIM - ST. LOUIS METRO).....	500,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FC)	HANNIBAL (AE&D).....	4,850,000	410,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FC)	MALINE CREEK (CP&E)	2,500,000	250,000	250,000	---	400,000	---	250,000	---
(SPEC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, MO-WATER SUPPLY STUDY	600,000	100,000	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	OSAGE RIVER BASIN ABOVE HARRY S TRUMAN DAM	1,255,000	570,000	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FDP)	ST LOUIS METROPOLITAN AREA, MO & IL	11,480,000	9,413,000	864,000	---	864,000	---	864,000	---
(N)	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL (CP&E)	1,700,000	600,000	250,000	---	600,000	---	250,000	---
	NEBRASKA								
(FDP)	REPUBLICAN RIVER, HARLAN COUNTY DAM TO MILFORD LK, NE & KS	500,000	300,000	100,000	---	200,000	---	100,000	---
	NEVADA								
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBUTARIES	1,250,000	450,000	375,000	---	375,000	---	375,000	---
(FDP)	VIRGIN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MOAPA VALLEY)	1,120,000	400,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	NEW JERSEY								
(FDP)	CAPE MAY POINT (PHASE I)	237,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA & DE	6,334,000	1,683,000	950,000	---	950,000	---	950,000	---
(N)	NY HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, NJ & NY	4,955,000	4,355,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	PASSAIC RIVER BASIN STUDY, NJ & NY (PHASE 1)	21,000,000	14,981,000	1,700,000	---	1,700,000	---	1,700,000	---
(FC)	RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, ROBINSON'S BRANCH, AT RAHWAY (CP&E)	850,000	535,000	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
(FC)	RAMAPO & MAHWAH RVRS AT MAHWAH, NJ & SUFFERN, NY (PH-1) (CP&E)	470,000	50,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN (CP&E)	5,000,000	---	445,000	---	445,000	---	445,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	NEW MEXICO								
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, N.MEX.	10,400,000	239,000	---	---	---	---	---	450,000
(FC)	MID RIO GRANDE BERNALILLO TO BELEN (CP&E)	2,300,000	1,060,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	PECOS RIVER AND TRIBS - CARLSBAD	1,500,000	400,000	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
(FC)	PUERCO RIVER AND TRIBS, GALLUP (CP&E)	600,000	340,000	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM & CO	6,720,000	5,318,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY - TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES UNIT (AE&D)	7,100,000	847,000	---	383,000	---	383,000	---	383,000
	NEW YORK								
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL	757,000	757,000	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK CITY, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT (CP&E)	970,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR (RECREATION STUDY)	115,000	---	---	---	115,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CATTARAUGUS CREEK	397,000	75,000	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
(COMP)	GENESEE RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT	845,000	100,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	KILL VAN KULL & NEWARK BAY CHANNEL (DEEPENING), NY & NJ (CP&E)	3,000,000	1,335,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	MOOSE & BLACK RIVERS (BLACK RIVER BASIN)	1,380,000	---	---	---	340,000	---	---	---
	REYNOLDS CHANNEL, JAMAICA BAY TO NY	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FC)	SAW MILL RIVER AT ELMSFORD AND GREENBURGH (AE&D)	6,490,000	590,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET (AE&D)	11,200,000	555,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY ADDDITIONAL LOCKS	4,057,000	3,434,000	375,000	---	375,000	---	375,000	---
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CO, STREAMS - MAMARONECK & SHELDRAKE RIVERS (CP&E)	2,640,000	1,405,000	600,000	---	800,000	---	600,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	NORTH CAROLINA								
(FDP)	EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA ABOVE CAPE LOOKOUT	1,530,000	160,000	355,000	---	355,000	---	355,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE PEE DEE & PEE DEE RIVERS, NC & SC	2,392,000	913,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(M)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR	200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	NEUSE RIVER, NC	2,892,000	825,000	225,000	---	425,000	---	225,000	---
(FDP)	ROANOKE RIVER SOUTH BOSTON AND VICINITY, NC & VA	2,643,000	2,388,000	255,000	---	255,000	---	255,000	---
(SP)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET	800,000	512,000	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
	NORTH DAKOTA								
(FC)	MOTT, N.DAK	55,000	---	---	---	---	---	55,000	---
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT (AE&D)	26,200,000	2,690,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000
(FDP)	SOURIS RIVER BASIN	1,190,000	340,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	300,000	---
	OHIO								
(SPEC)	CENTRAL OHIO COMPREHENSIVE	200,000	3,135,000	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY, GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS INTERIM	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY	4,035,000	3,135,000	375,000	---	375,000	---	375,000	---
(FC)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY AT NELSONVILLE (CP&E)	645,000	515,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FDP)	CUYAHOGA RIVER BASIN	1,447,000	1,348,000	99,000	---	99,000	---	99,000	---
(FC)	FAIRFIELD (CP&E)	600,000	350,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	HOLES CREEK AT W. CARROLLTON & MORAINE (CP&E)	570,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	MIAMI RIVER, LITTLE MIAMI R & MILL CR BASINS	4,323,000	3,923,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	MUSKINGUM RIVER (WOLF CR & TUSCARAWAS RV INTERIM STUDY)	600,000	200,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SPEC)	OHIO RIVER BETWEEN RIVER MILES 40-491 (WATERFRONT IMPROVEMENT)	500,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	VERMILION RIVER	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS--Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	OKLAHOMA								
(COMP)	ARK RIV & TRIBS, SOUTH CENTRAL & SOUTHEAST AREAS OF OK (COMP)	1,150,000	300,000	300,000	---	600,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	CANADIAN RIVER AND TRIBS, OK, TX, AND NM (REMAINING)	2,670,000	2,033,000	250,000	---	400,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	CENTRAL OKLAHOMA PROJECT	2,540,000	1,670,000	90,000	---	---	---	90,000	---
(FDP)	HUGO LAKE (HYDROPOWER STUDY) (REVIEW)	980,000	236,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	LUKFATA LAKE (HYDROPOWER STUDY) (REVIEW)	810,000	344,000	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FC)	MINGO CREEK (CP&E)	1,800,000	400,000	500,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FC)	PARKER LAKE (CP&E)	2,000,000	877,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(SPEC)	PINE CREEK LAKE (HYDROPOWER STUDY) (REVIEW)	660,000	620,000	---	---	40,000	---	---	---
(COMP)	RED RIVER BASIN, OK, AR, LA & TX (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY)	1,670,000	590,000	350,000	---	700,000	---	350,000	---
	OREGON								
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER COAL EXPORT CHANNEL, ASTORIA	2,585,000	2,077,000	508,000	---	508,000	---	508,000	---
(FDP)	MALHEUR LAKE	584,000	240,000	165,000	---	165,000	---	330,000	---
(FDP)	UMPQUA RIVER & TRIBS	2,286,000	300,000	480,000	---	480,000	---	480,000	---
(COMP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN	3,725,000	1,594,000	475,000	---	475,000	---	475,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA								
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO WILMINGTON (CPE)	2,500,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY-SUSQUEHANNA RIVER DROUGHT MANAGEMENT (PA, NY, & MD)	900,000	---	---	---	900,000	---	---	---
(FC)	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM (MODIFICATION) (AE&D)	111,000,000	4,299,000	---	1,556,000	---	1,556,000	---	1,556,000
(FDP)	KISKIMINETAS RIVER BASIN	2,205,000	1,020,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	LEHIGH RIVER BASIN STUDY	2,200,000	1,635,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN, PA (PH-I) (CP&E)	2,025,000	1,100,000	725,000	---	725,000	---	725,000	---
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 7 AND 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA & WV (CP&E)	4,850,000	1,600,000	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PHASE II (CP&E).....	570,000	455,000	115,000	---	115,000	---	115,000	---
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE (MODIFICATION) (AE&D).....	41,300,000	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	---
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA BASIN AT HARRISBURG (CP&E).....	2,900,000	1,618,000	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY (LEVEE RAISING) (PH-1) (CP&E).....	5,700,000	1,150,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	PUERTO RICO								
(FDP)	GUAMAJIDO RIVER.....	884,000	90,000	185,000	---	185,000	---	185,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA.....	911,000	390,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
	RHODE ISLAND								
(N)	BRISTOL HARBOR (AE&D).....	2,560,000	337,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000
(FDP)	PAWCATUCK RIVER & NARRAGANSETT BAY.....	4,660,000	4,510,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	SOUTH CAROLINA								
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR (PHASE 1) (CP&E).....	1,120,000	700,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	GILLS CREEK.....	1,824,000	1,414,000	410,000	---	410,000	---	410,000	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA								
(FDP)	EASTERN SD AND UPPER BIG SIOUX RIVER SD AND IA.....	2,823,000	2,633,000	182,000	---	182,000	---	182,000	---
(FDP)	MISSOURI RIVER, SD, ND, & MT.....	7,590,000	6,507,000	648,000	---	648,000	---	648,000	---
(FDP)	WESTERN DAKOTAS REGION OF SD.....	2,143,000	1,569,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	TENNESSEE								
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE.....	4,297,000	3,567,000	415,000	---	415,000	---	415,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	TEXAS								
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	6,610,000	5,479,000	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FDP)	COLORADO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	5,490,000	5,046,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	DENISON DAM-LAKE TEXOMA RED RIVER, TX & OK	985,000	778,000	207,000	---	207,000	---	207,000	---
(FDP)	DICKINSON BAYOU	1,100,000	625,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	GALVESTON BAY AREA NAVIGATION STUDY	4,030,000	3,800,000	230,000	---	230,000	---	230,000	---
(FDP)	HILLEBRANDT BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	250,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	JOHNSON CREEK, ARLINGTON	940,000	738,000	202,000	---	202,000	---	202,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE CYPRESS CREEK, TX & LA	1,730,000	1,435,000	165,000	---	165,000	---	165,000	---
(FDP)	RED RIVER AND TRIBS ABOVE DENISON DAM, TX, OK & NM (REMAINING)	4,280,000	1,330,000	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(MP)	ROCKLAND LAKE (AE&D)	734,000,000	110,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	SAN JACINTO RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	3,290,000	2,527,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU AT HOUSTON (CP&E)	1,980,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL	1,480,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(MP)	TRINITY RIVER, CHANNEL TO LIBERTY (AE&D)	163,000,000	14,505,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	UPPER WHITE OAK BAYOU & TRIBS, VICINITY OF HOUSTON (CP&E)	3,710,000	1,649,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
	UTAH								
(FDP)	COLORADO RIVER & TRIBS, ABOVE LEE FERRY, UT, AZ, CO, NM & WY	2,550,000	1,737,000	237,000	---	237,000	---	237,000	---
(FDP)	JORDAN RIVER BASIN	2,650,000	2,150,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
	VIRGINIA								
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW (REVIEW)	710,000	350,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING) (CP&E)	12,400,000	9,600,000	2,800,000	---	2,800,000	---	2,800,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(FC)	RICHMOND (PHASE I) (CP&E) (LOCAL PROTECTION)	3,800,000	1,665,000	1,240,000	---	1,240,000	---	1,240,000	---
(FDP)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN	2,900,000	1,932,000	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
	WASHINGTON								
(N)	BELLINGHAM HARBOR	150,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CHEHALIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	2,931,000	2,677,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER AT SOUTH ABERDEEN AND COSMOPOLIS (CP&E)	1,097,000	500,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FC)	COWLITZ RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (CP&E)	7,300,000	4,400,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(N)	EAST WEST & DUWAMISH WW SEATTLE HARBOR (CP&E)	1,370,000	400,000	600,000	---	800,000	---	600,000	---
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR CHEHALIS AND HOQUIAM RIVERS (CP&E)	3,360,000	2,017,000	950,000	---	950,000	---	950,000	---
(FDP)	MILL CREEK BASIN	900,000	365,000	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR	150,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(COMP)	PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS	8,383,000	6,325,000	362,000	---	684,000	---	362,000	---
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR - DUWAMISH WATERWAY	3,514,000	2,841,000	178,000	---	178,000	---	178,000	---
(FC)	YAKIMA RIVER AT UNION GAP (CP&E)	566,000	250,000	316,000	---	316,000	---	316,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA								
(FDP)	GUYANDOTTE RIVER BASIN, VIC LOGAN & MULLENS	2,229,000	2,019,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(COMP)	KANAWHA BASIN COMPREHENSIVE (AUTHORIZATION REPORTS), WV,VA & NC	4,604,000	6,437,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION	3,850,000	2,625,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	WISCONSIN								
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR	130,000	---	---	---	130,000	---	---	---
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES (AE&D)	20,800,000	1,742,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS								
	REVIEW FOR DEAUTHORIZATION	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	---	---	5,600,000	---	5,950,000	---	6,045,000	---
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA								
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	---	---	8,300,000	---	8,300,000	---	7,300,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	235,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	---	---	130,000	---	130,000	---	120,000	---
	COASTAL DATA COLLECTION	---	---	1,800,000	---	1,800,000	---	1,600,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	TOTAL			12,080,000	---	12,080,000	---	10,855,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	---	---	21,500,000	---	22,200,000	---	19,000,000	---
	SUBTOTAL GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			116,596,000	5,404,000	129,910,000	6,714,000	120,236,000	6,654,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS & SLIPPAGE.....	---	---	-3,000,000	---	-3,435,000	---	-6,193,000	---
	TOTAL GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....			119,000,000		133,189,000		120,697,000	

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP) SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC) SPECIAL
(COMP) COMPREHENSIVE
(PHASE I) AUTHORIZD FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

Mermentau, Vermilion, and Calcasieu Rivers and Bayou Teche, LA.—The bill includes an additional $120,000 to initiate the feasibility phase of a study to determine the advisability and feasibility of enlarging the upper reach to the Bayou Teche and recommend other changes as necessary to provide for flood control, salinity control, water supply, and related purposes in the Teche and Vermilion Basins, LA. The Teche-Vermilion Freshwater District has advanced $110,000 for the reconnaissance phase of this study, therefore, the Committee expects this contribution to be credited toward the non-Federal share of the study.

Gila River and tributaries, AZ.—Within funds provided for the overall Gila River and tributaries study in Arizona, the Committee directs that $150,000 be used to expedite the Santa Cruz interim study.

Pearl River Basin, MS.—The Committee has included $830,000 under the Pearl River Basin study to initiate continuation of planning and engineering on the Shoccoe Dam which is needed to provide flood protection for the city of Jackson, MS.

Malheur Lake, OR.--In action on the 1985 Energy and Water appropriations bill, Congress provided funds for the Corps of Engineers to complete a reconnaissance level study and begin the feasibility investigation of the serious flooding problems at Malheur Lake. The Committee recommendation for fiscal 1986 provides sufficient funds to cover the full cost to complete the feasibility study.

Section 22 technical assistance to States.—The Committee allowance includes $116,000, the full amount requested, to assist the State of New Mexico in the development of a State water plan. The requirement for in-house work by the Corps of Engineers is hereby waived for this work.

The Committee directs that $200,000 is to be utilized by the Corps of Engineers to assist the State of North Dakota in developing such a technical resource service. Further, the Committee expects the Corps to consolidate in one district, as quickly as possible, the section 22 responsibiiities in North Dakota and to request sufficient funds to carry out that coordination responsibility.

In addition, the Committee recommendation includes $200,000 for Pennsylvania and $125,000 for New Jersey.

Locks and dams 52 and 53, Kentucky.—Within the amount recommended for general investigations $250,000 is provided for continued planning and engineering design to advance such critical activities as geotechnical investigations and hydraulic modeling of the locks and dams 52 and 53 project in Kentucky.

Presque Isle, PA.—The Committee expects that continued planning and engineering of a permanent solution to the serious beach erosion problem at Presque Isle, PA, will be completed in early 1986. Further, the Committee expects to receive and take prompt action on a supplemental funding request as soon as project construction is authorized.

Chesapeake Bay, cleanup study, MD and VA.—The Committee has included $900,000 to continue Chesapeake Bay cleanup studies initiated last year. The Committee recommendation includes sufficient funds for

the Corps of Engineers to begin low-cost erosion control work under the authority of section 54 of the 1976 Water Resource Development Act.

The Committee again notes the unique nature of the Chesapeake Bay and its importance as a national resource. Based on the President's commitment to the Bay in the 1984 State of the Union message and the six agency memoranda of understanding to improve conditions in cooperation with State and local interests, the Committee urges the administration to place a high priority on the work in the future.

Rochester, MN, local protection project.—The Corps of Engineers is to use $250,000 of available funds to continue planning and engineering design of the Rochester, MN, local protection project.

Las Cruces, NM.—The Committee is aware of the serious flood threat in the area of the outlet channel of Las Cruces Dam to the Rio Grande River. Given the severity of the situation, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use $50,000 of available funds to undertake a reconnaissance level study of the problem.

Cottonwood Creek, CA.—While the Committee has provided no funding for the Cottonwood Creek project because of budget constraints, should the State of California decide to support construction of the project, the Committee expects the Corps to continue design of the project using available funds.

Rio Grande of Arecibo, PR.—Within the funds provided, the Corps is to use $75,000 to undertake a reconnaissance level study of the flooding of the Rio Grande of Arecibo in Puerto Rico.

Mott, ND.—The Committee recommendation includes $55,000 to determine the cost and feasibility of building a permanent dike at the south end of Main Street and east of the Cannonball River in Mott, ND.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1985	$1,115,000,000
Budget estimate, 1986	842,000,000
House allowance	952,438,000
Committee recommendation	829,581,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−12,419,000
House allowance	−122,857,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $829,581,000. This is $122,857,000 below the House allowance and $60,419,000 under the current year level.

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended. Immediately following the table, the Committee has outlined special reductions and changes made in the budgeted projects together with selected other Committee actions.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	ALASKA					
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES	263,000,000	196,605,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(MP)	SKETTISHAM	139,000,000	94,853,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
	ARIZONA					
(FC)	INDIAN BEND WASH	31,920,000	31,920,000	---	800,000	---
(FC)	PHOENIX ARIZONA AND VICINITY (STAGE 2)	246,000,000	43,757,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
	ARKANSAS					
(M)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAV SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR & OK	548,428,000	539,766,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(M)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	261,000,000	207,524,000	1,200,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
(M)	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION AR, LA, OK, & TX	70,346,000	63,346,000	---	---	3,000,000
	CALIFORNIA					
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK	12,300,000	7,610,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE	343,000,000	288,835,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	11,800,000
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS	15,100,000	460,000	1,200,000	---	-
(M)	FISHERMAN'S WHARF AREA	11,700,000	4,050,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA (REHAB)	43,600,000	14,020,000	11,800,000	11,800,000	11,800,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	5,600,000	2,650,000	---	2,900,000	1,000,000
(FC)	LYTLE AND WARM CREEKS	37,600,000	35,246,000	2,354,000	2,354,000	2,354,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS	72,200,000	6,350,000	4,000,000	---	---
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE	383,000,000	340,938,000	1,200,000	6,000,000	1,200,000
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER	2,790,000	560,000	500,000	---	---
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT	92,000,000	51,346,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT	75,525,000	67,926,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, CHICO LANDING TO RED BLUFF	31,000,000	12,295,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES	11,900,000	11,549,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL	43,200,000	1,475,000	1,300,000	---	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON	149,000,000	37,243,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER	29,300,000	2,024,000	1,400,000	---	---
(N)	SANTA CRUZ HARBOR	4,202,000	120,000	2,230,000	2,230,000	2,230,000
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER	24,200,000	7,125,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	6,000,000
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK	68,100,000	41,076,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS	16,900,000	1,930,000	100,000	1,700,000	800,000
	COLORADO					
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE	96,000,000	90,977,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
(FC)	FOUNTAIN CREEK AT PUEBLO	5,825,000	340,000	1,360,000	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	DELAWARE					
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION	129,000,000	2,054,000	575,000	575,000	575,000
	FLORIDA					
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR	25,800,000	4,080,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(FC)	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA	829,000,000	287,056,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY	50,400,000	30,744,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY	14,100,000	10,469,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS	197,000,000	71,676,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY	19,400,000	3,410,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR - MAIN CHANNEL	172,500,000	164,447,000	7,923,000	7,923,000	7,923,000
	GEORGIA					
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	535,000,000	417,490,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR WIDENING	7,350,000	800,000	2,500,000	---	---
(BE)	TYBEE ISLAND	5,635,000	2,530,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
	HAWAII					
(FC)	KAHOMA STREAM	15,500,000	749,000	3,000,000	---	---

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	ILLINOIS					
(N)	BRANDON ROAD LOCK AND DAM, ILLINOIS RIVER (REHAB).....	22,300,000	12,730,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
(FC)	EAST ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY.....	32,700,000	14,719,000	930,000	930,000	930,000
(FC)	KASKASKIA ISLAND DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT.....	13,200,000	7,750,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION.....	141,000,000	133,100,000	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 26, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALTON, IL & MO....	753,000,000	335,113,000	75,500,000	75,500,000	75,500,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAM 53, IL & KY (REHAB).....	6,030,000	5,095,000	935,000	935,000	935,000
(FC)	MILAN.....	14,500,000	12,738,000	1,762,000	1,762,000	1,762,000
(FC)	MOLINE.....	15,810,000	1,440,000	1,880,000	---	---
(FC)	ROCKFORD.....	10,500,000	8,404,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(N)	SMITHLAND LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL, IN & KY.....	276,500,000	270,556,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
	INDIANA					
(FC)	EVANSVILLE.....	51,400,000	29,050,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
	IOWA					
(FC)	AMES LAKE.....	59,500,000	250,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
(FC)	BETTENDORF.....	13,800,000	10,482,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO.....	275,000,000	94,621,000	850,000	850,000	850,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IOWA.....	124,200,000	105,557,000	---	4,300,000	1,500,000
(FC)	WATERLOO.....	50,000,000	47,500,000	---	2,500,000	---

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	KENTUCKY					
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM & LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	17,400,000	---	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	BIG SOUTH FORK NATIONAL RIVER AND RECREATION AREA, KY & TN	103,522,000	82,054,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	SOUTHWESTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY	60,600,000	39,431,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE	90,900,000	45,045,000	---	6,000,000	---
	LOUISIANA					
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	619,000,000	163,480,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	61,000,000	37,202,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	MISS RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	445,000,000	47,317,000	8,800,000	10,800,000	8,800,000
(N)	MISS RIVER-GULF OUTLET	489,000,000	80,810,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
(FC)	MORGAN CITY AND VICINITY (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	27,000,000	2,055,000	120,000	120,000	120,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	166,100,000	54,469,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT	1,517,000,000	573,971,000	90,000,000	95,700,000	95,700,000
	MARYLAND					
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (CONNECTING CHANNEL TO THE CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL)	61,300,000	25,340,000	---	5,000,000	---

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	MASSACHUSETTS					
(BE)	REVERE BEACH	4,550,000	497,000	700,000	---	---
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY	23,500,000	440,000	1,500,000	---	---
	MICHIGAN					
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR (REHAB)	9,800,000	6,900,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
(N)	PORT AUSTIN HARBOR	2,800,000	---	---	2,800,000	---
	MINNESOTA					
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK	24,300,000	1,700,000	2,500,000	---	---
(FC)	CHASKA	18,600,000	1,773,000	1,600,000	---	---
(FC)	MANKATO AND NORTH MANKATO	98,700,000	65,991,000	13,100,000	13,100,000	13,100,000
	MISSISSIPPI					
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	50,000,000	16,309,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
	MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL	128,000,000	11,715,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE	330,000,000	314,664,000	---	1,000,000	---

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	544,000,000	519,690,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES	137,000,000	123,188,000	9,400,000	9,400,000	9,400,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER CHANNEL	26,200,000	25,483,000	717,000	717,000	717,000
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN FLOOD WARNING SYSTEM	470,000	---	---	470,000	470,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	183,000,000	65,936,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
	NEBRASKA					
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES	46,400,000	43,717,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	NEW JERSEY					
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET	10,800,000	210,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FDP)	PASSAIC RIVER BASIN FLOOD WARNING SYSTEM	500,000	---	---	---	500,000
(FC)	SEABRIGHT TO OCEAN TOWNSHIP	86,200,000	1,320,000	---	1,500,000	---
	NEW MEXICO					
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	3,260,000	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	NEW YORK					
(FC)	ARDSLEY	3,680,000	455,000	480,000	---	---
(FC)	BINGHAMTON (DEF CORR)	400,000	---	---	400,000	400,000
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY	25,900,000	17,900,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(FC)	ELLICOTT CREEK	13,800,000	1,879,000	1,000,000	---	---
(N)	NY HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY & NJ	52,300,000	17,229,000	3,700,000	5,000,000	3,700,000
	NORTH CAROLINA					
(N)	AIWW, REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES	45,100,000	16,197,000	2,176,000	2,176,000	2,176,000
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE	136,000,000	107,808,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE	167,000,000	133,221,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
(FC)	RANDLEMAN LAKE	58,300,000	4,171,000	2,700,000	---	---
	NORTH DAKOTA					
(FC)	LAKE DARLING, SOURIS RIVER	59,600,000	6,050,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
	OHIO					
(FC)	MILL CREEK	162,000,000	30,772,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (REHAB)	44,200,000	19,045,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	NEWARK	9,900,000	5,426,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	POINT PLACE	9,620,000	8,649,000	971,000	971,000	971,000
	OKLAHOMA					
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE	84,500,000	67,986,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE	79,935,000	77,035,000	---	2,500,000	---
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE (BRIDGE REPLACEMENT)	1,720,000	122,489,000	---	800,000	---
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE	55,825,000	53,233,000	---	7,700,000	---
	OREGON					
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWER UNITS, OR & WA	---	6,000	500,000	---	---
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA	646,000,000	626,746,000	7,300,000	7,300,000	7,300,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE	117,000,000	21,867,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	18,000,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, LAKE UMATILLA, OR & WA	511,000,000	504,643,000	6,358,000	6,358,000	6,358,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA	25,400,000	17,854,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(M)	SIUSLAW RIVER AND BAR	30,500,000	26,225,000	4,275,000	4,275,000	4,275,000
(MP)	STRUBE LAKE AND COUGAR ADDITIONAL UNIT	---	1,790,000	400,000	---	---
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION	31,400,000	25,372,000	1,500,000	1,5[illegible]00	1,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	PENNSYLVANIA					
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE (MODIFICATION)	3,120,000	1,160,000	500,000	---	---
(N)	MONTGOMERY LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER (REHAB)	28,900,000	10,300,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA	16,446,000	10,618,000	1,160,000	1,160,000	1,160,000
(FC)	TAMAQUA	10,700,000	1,750,000	2,120,000	---	---
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY (DEF CORR)	27,900,000	12,280,000	2,395,000	2,395,000	2,395,000
	PUERTO RICO					
(N)	PONCE HARBOR	4,828,000	295,000	350,000	---	---
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS	326,000,000	121,426,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA					
(N)	COOPER RIVER SEISMIC MODIFICATION	22,000,000	2,000,000	---	200,000	8,200,000
	TEXAS					
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBS, TX - ADDICKS & BARKER DAMS (DAM SAFETY)	15,000,000	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK	77,578,000	2,836,000	2,000,000	---	---
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS	146,000,000	24,020,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT).....	79,700,000	38,675,000	9,600,000	9,600,000	9,600,000
(FC)	EL PASO.....	71,300,000	53,979,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR (1970 ACT).....	33,919,000	968,000	2,000,000	---	---
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX (1970 ACT) (RELOC OF NORTH JETTY).	13,300,000	400,000	2,400,000	---	---
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE.....	187,700,000	157,838,000	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS.....	16,400,000	1,370,000	1,500,000	---	---
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER.....	30,800,000	9,719,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE.....	280,000,000	158,095,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000
(FC)	RED RIVER LEVEES AND BANK STAB BELOW DENISON DAM, TX, AR, & LA.....	59,650,000	58,660,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT.....	85,900,000	38,101,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	SAN GABRIEL RIVER.....	158,000,000	101,582,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU.....	54,600,000	11,393,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
(FC)	VINCE AND LITTLE VINCE BAYOU.....	19,600,000	13,668,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(N)	WALLISVILLE LAKE.....	63,300,000	25,460,000	---	100,000	100,000
	UTAH					
(FC)	LITTLE DELL LAKE.....	52,300,000	565,000	3,000,000	---	---

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	VIRGINIA					
(FC)	HAYSI LAKE	20,900,000	2,700,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	VIRGINIA BEACH STREAMS, CANAL NO. TWO	3,900,000	422,000	1,000,000	---	---
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH (REIMB)	5,500,000	3,940,000	480,000	480,000	480,000
	WASHINGTON					
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS	387,000,000	347,534,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	13,340,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR & ID	168,000,000	106,361,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE (REHAB)	17,400,000	14,898,000	2,502,000	2,502,000	2,502,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS & VICINITY	43,575,000	32,825,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	23,800,000	---	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
	WEST VIRGINIA					
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE	48,200,000	42,442,000	508,000	508,000	508,000
(N)	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS & DAM, WV & OH	111,000,000	---	1,350,000	---	---
(FC)	LEVISA/TUG FORKS OF BIG SANDY & UPPER CUMBERLAND RVRS, WV, VA	233,000,000	43,600,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE	203,000,000	134,110,000	26,700,000	26,700,000	26,700,000

New construction starts.—The Committee notes with some concern that the House has included funding for continuation of the 62 new construction starts recommended to the House by the House Committee on Appropriations in the 1985 supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 2577. It should be pointed out that the House rejected the Committee recommendation by eliminating the unauthorized projects.

The Committee feels that, since legislation is pending in conference, it is premature to recommend additional funding until the differences between the House and Senate on H.R. 2577 are resolved. The Committee will consider additional funding needs for new start projects after enactment of H.R. 2577.

Wallisville Lake, TX.—The Committee concurs with the House Committee and has included $100,000 in the bill for continued design of the Wallisville Lake, TX, project. The Committee believes that the February 25, 1984, record of decision, as supported by the Wallisville Lake, TX, Post-Authorization Change Report (July 1981), the Supplemental Information to the Post-Authorization Change Report (July 1982), the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Wallisville Lake, TX (September 1983), and the Supplemental Information Report to the Final Environmental Statement (February 1984) provide a sound basis for investigation of the environmental impacts of the project and urges the earliest possible completion of the project.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, LA.—The Committee is aware that Public Law 98–360 directed initiation of construction of lock and dam No. 3 on the Red River Waterway project. However, the Secretary of the Army continues to delay construction and at this time is planning to award only a small contract for an access road. The Committee considers this action to be most inefficient and more costly to the Federal Government. Continued delay of the realignment and bank stabilization measures are causing extensive erosion and bank caving which is threatening public and private facilities and will continue to result in increased dredging costs for the completed portion of the project.

The Committee is also aware that a draft recreation cost-sharing agreement has been under development since 1983 and that non-Federal interests have recently agreed to cost share in these facilities in accordance with the administration's policy for cost sharing. Although construction of the navigation facilities at pool 1 are complete, and near completion at pool 2, development of the recreation potential continues to be delayed. Accordingly, the Committee has added $5,700,000 to the bill to ensure that significant construction is commenced and directs the Corps of Engineers to initiate continuing contracts in fiscal year 1986 for continuation of lock and dam No. 3, realignment and bank stabilization measures at pools 3, 4, and 5, and recreation facilities at pools 1 and 2.

Nazline Wash, Chinle, AZ.—The Committee is aware of a severe erosion problem in Chinle, AZ, which, if allowed to continue, could damage the local sewage treatment plant. Because of the impending threat

to this important public facility, the Committee has included $200,000 under the section 14 Emergency Protection Program and directs the Corps to undertake measures to provide protection to the sewage treatment plant.

Tall Timbers, MD, shore damage mitigation (sec. 111).—The Committee has included $850,000 for the mitigation of shore damage attributable to a navigation project on the Potomac River at Tall Timbers, St. Marys County, MD.

Chief Joseph additional units, Washington.—The Committee has deferred $660,000 of the $14,000,000 budget request for the Chief Joseph additional units project pending resolution of a contract dispute over turbine performance. Given the magnitude of the additional cost to modify the turbines, the Committee believes it is premature to begin the modification if savings to the Federal Government are possible. The Committee urges all parties to work in good faith to resolve this dispute at the earliest possible time.

Levisa/Tug Fork, Big Sandy, and Upper Cumberland Rivers, WV, KY, and VA.—Within the funds provided, the Corps of Engineers is urged to proceed at the maximum practical pace on all section 202 project planning activities, including those related to Kermit, Big Bend, and Tug Fork tributaries.

Small flood control projects (section 205).—The Committee recommendation for section 205 small flood control projects includes $4,000,000 for the Puerco River and tributaries project at Gallup, NM. The Committee directs that the Chief of Engineers construct a plan of improvement described in the Chief of Engineer's report dated January 23, 1984.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1985	$50,000,000
Budget estimate, 1986	25,000,000
House allowance	25,000,000
Committee recommendation	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−15,000,000
House allowance	−15,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,000,000 for flood control and coastal emergencies.

The funds recommended provide for advance preparation measures associated with flood emergencies, flood fighting and rescue operations, and other emergency work.

The Committee has been informed of severe flood and erosion currently threatening the three Alaskan communities of Dillingham, Bethel, and Galena. The Committee directs that $1,500,000 of flood control and coastal emergencies funds be used by the Corps of Engineers to undertake emergency measures to correct the flooding and erosion problems in these three communities. The Committee recognizes that this is an interim measure designed to slow the damage that is presently occurring. This provision is not intended to influence or effect any ongoing studies the Corps may be conducting at these sites.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriations, 1985	$321,000,000
Budget estimate, 1986	269,000,000
House allowance	321,685,000
Committee recommendation	285,735,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+16,735,000
House allowance	−35,950,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $285,735,000, which is $35,950,000 below the House allowance and $16,735,000 over the budget request.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended with the budget request and the House allowance for activities and projects under this heading.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	MISCELLANEOUS					
	SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107).....	---	---	4,850,000	9,365,000	4,850,000
	SMALL BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)....	---	---	2,150,000	3,043,000	2,150,000
	SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD CONTROL & RELATED PURPOSES (SECTION 205).....	---	---	27,600,000	27,950,000	31,600,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14).....	---	---	7,200,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES ATTRIBUTABLE TO NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 111).....	---	---	---	850,000	850,000
	SMALL SNAGGING & CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208).....	---	---	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT).....	---	---	8,000,000	10,000,000	8,000,000
	EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION.....	---	---	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
	DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAM.....	---	---	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	---	---	-53,061,000	-65,561,000	-60,000,000
	ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION STARTS.....	---	---	---	100,000,000	---
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL.....			842,000,000	952,438,000	829,581,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP) SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC) SPECIAL
(COMP) COMPREHENSIVE
(PHASE I) AUTHORIZD FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
SURVEYS:				
GENERAL STUDIES:				
BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA.....	6,440,000	500,000	1,100,000	500,000
BUSHLEY BAYOU AREA LA.....	950,000	---	350,000	---
ST. FRANCIS RIVER BASIN BELOW WAPPAPELLO LAKE, AR & MO.....	3,165,000	270,000	270,000	270,000
BAYOU DU CHIEN, KY.....	935,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
LARTO LAKE-SALINE LAKE AREA, LA.....	1,400,000	---	400,000	---
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN (WATER & LAND RESOURCES), LA...	6,930,000	311,000	311,000	311,000
MISSISSIPPI & LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS (CP&E).....	3,800,000	140,000	1,240,000	640,000
SOUTHWEST MISSISSIPPI TRIBUTARIES BASIN, MS.....	2,450,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
YAZOO RIVER BASIN, MS.....	8,860,000	360,000	360,000	360,000
EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, AR..	2,250,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY (CP&E)....	2,100,000	564,000	564,000	564,000
NONCONNAH CR, TN & MS (CP&E).....	1,300,000	500,000	500,000	500,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
OBION AND FORKED DEER RIVERS AND TRIBS., TN & KY.	1,530,000	300,000	---	---
REELFOOT LAKE, TN.	400,000	---	400,000	400,000
TIPTONVILLE	225,000	---	225,000	225,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	270,000	270,000	270,000
ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:				
EASTERN RAPIDES & SOUTH CENTRAL AVOYELLES, LA.	60,800,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
L'ANGUILLE RIVER BASIN, AR.	25,800,000	370,000	370,000	370,000
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION SALINITY CONTROL STRUCTURE, LA.	34,800,000	845,000	845,000	845,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		5,470,000	8,245,000	6,295,000
CONSTRUCTION				
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	3,013,000,000	68,000,000	68,000,000	68,000,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	1,345,326,000	28,600,000	28,600,000	28,600,000
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO.	369,000,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	(454,000,000)	(9,300,000)	(7,810,000)	(7,810,000)
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, EXCEPT LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT	141,700,000	650,000	650,000	650,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT	91,300,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, EXCEPT TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT	165,600,000	1,965,000	475,000	475,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT	55,400,000	6,585,000	6,585,000	6,585,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,463,000,000	26,300,000	28,000,000	26,300,000
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	26,000,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
OLD RIVER, LA	307,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000
SARDIS LAKE, MS (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	9,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,415,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(36,500,000)	(23,000,000)
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER	104,000,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
MAIN STEM	162,000,000	1,300,000	5,300,000	1,300,000
TRIBUTARIES:				
EXCEPT ASCALMORE-TIPPO AND OPPOSSUM BAYOUS	190,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS (FORMERLY AUXILIARY CHANNEL)	376,572,000	9,200,000	9,200,000	9,200,000
YAZOO BACKWATER	350,000,000	2,700,000	7,700,000	5,700,000
DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL	16,799,000	---	7,500,000	---
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	102,000,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1985	$1,307,600,000
Budget estimate, 1986	961,000,000
House allowance	1,325,195,000
Committee recommendation	1,302,800,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+341,800,000
House allowance	−22,395,000

An appropriation of $1,302,800,000 is recommended, which is $22,395,000 below the House allowance.

The budget request for the account included a $355,000,000 reduction based on the receipt of revenues from user fees. Legislation enacting these increased fees has not been passed by either House of Congress and it is doubtful if the full $355,000,000 will be available. Therefore, the Committee has restored, in large part, the funds necessary to provide adequate operations and maintenance for Corps projects nationwide.

The Committee is aware of growing operation and maintenance requirements nationwide, and the continuously changing needs and priorities. It is often necessary to accomplish work scheduled for the budget year in the current year, and it is not uncommon for the Corps to divert operation and maintenance funds to unscheduled emergency maintenance requirements.

The funding recommended is the largest level ever provided for operation and maintenance activities. The Committee is aware of the efforts of the Corps to stretch the scarce O&M dollars to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of methods. As more and more projects come into the inventory and fiscal constraints reduce budgetary resources, it is clear that the Corps will need to change its traditional approach to undertaking the required O&M work nationwide. Adjustments in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be considered. However, in optimizing its use of the limited resources available, the Corps should insure maximum public benefits for navigation, hydropower, and flood control.

The 1986 budget request was based on estimates which were developed 18 months ago. Maintenance dredging requirements in navigation channels vary with weather conditions, equipment availability, and usage. Further, good bid experience could free-up additional dollars to accomplish unscheduled work. Specific allocations impede the Corps' ability to adjust to continuously changing needs. Only if the Corps' financial flexibility to respond to emergencies and other unanticipated urgent requirements is preserved can the Chief of Engineers carry out his responsibility to perform the O&M work of greatest overall importance to the Nation.

The attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance or review and for which the Committee has received requests—the Sabine-Neches Waterway in Texas; Santa Cruz Harbor, CA; bank stabilization structures in South Dakota and Nebraska authorized under section 707 of Public Law 95–625; the

Intracoastal Waterway in New Jersey; the need for additional mosquito spraying at Garrison Dam near Williston, ND; and additional channel dredging at Racine, WI.

Stream gauging activities.—The Committee is aware that the Rock Island District of the Corps of Engineers is presently planning to contract out stream gauging activities instead of continuing with the long-standing program of cooperating with States' and other Federal agencies in the nationwide cooperative program. The Committee is concerned that these major changes are being made without adequate consultation with the impacted States and may significantly affect water resource planning and other activities in the affected area. The Corps should consult with the users who are concerned with the Corps' role and its proposed changes in an effort to find a satisfactory arrangement to the planned changes in this cooperative program.

The following table is included for illustrative purposes only and shows the estimated work allowances for fiscal year 1983:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA-COOSA RIVERS	5,204,000	5,204,000
BAYOU LABATRE	11,000	11,000
BLACK WARRIOR & TOMBIGBEE RIVERS	8,449,000	8,449,000
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY	35,000	35,000
DOG AND FOWL RIVERS	119,000	119,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (MOBILE DISTRICT)	3,514,000	3,514,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK & DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL,AL & GA	3,513,000	3,513,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAKE	3,257,000	3,257,000
MOBILE HARBOR	1,927,000	1,927,000
PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL	17,000	17,000
ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK & DAM	2,511,000	2,511,000
TENNESSEE TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	12,632,000	12,632,000
WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	4,253,000	4,253,000
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR	1,265,000	1,265,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES	898,000	898,000
DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR	385,000	385,000
HOMER HARBOR	279,000	279,000
NINILCHIK SMALL BOAT HARBOR	244,000	244,000
NOME HARBOR	702,000	702,000
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE	661,000	661,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM	651,000	651,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM	112,000	112,000
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE	2,357,000	2,357,000
BLAKELY MOUNTAIN DAM, LAKE OUACHITA	3,065,000	3,065,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE	698,000	698,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE	3,539,000	3,539,000
DARDANELLE LOCK & DAM	3,629,000	3,629,000
DEGRAY LAKE	2,497,000	2,497,000
DEQUEEN LAKE	629,000	629,000
DIERKS LAKE	714,000	714,000
GILLHAM LAKE	573,000	573,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE	3,252,000	3,252,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
HELENA HARBOR	388,000	388,000
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAV SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS	15,680,000	15,680,000
MILLWOOD LAKE	1,420,000	1,420,000
NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON	2,415,000	2,415,000
NIMROD LAKE	814,000	814,000
NORFORK LAKE	2,405,000	2,405,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR	508,000	508,000
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	4,817,000	4,817,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK & DAM	2,660,000	2,660,000
WHITE RIVER	1,785,000	1,785,000
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE	1,141,000	1,141,000
BUCHANAN DAM - H. V. EASTMAN LAKE	1,023,000	1,023,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO)	3,742,000	3,742,000
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR	2,138,000	2,138,000
DRIFT REMOVAL (SF HARBOR & BAY)	1,330,000	1,330,000
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE & CHANNEL	1,772,000	1,772,000
FARMINGTON DAM	129,000	129,000
HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE	999,000	999,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR & BAY	4,625,000	4,625,000
ISABELLA LAKE	2,856,000	2,856,000
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL	135,000	135,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA	2,881,000	2,881,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP	126,000	126,000
MOJAVE RIVER DAM	171,000	171,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE	1,120,000	1,120,000
NEW MELONES LAKE	569,000	569,000
NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR	460,000	460,000
OAKLAND HARBOR	1,240,000	1,240,000
OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS	2,700,000	2,700,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR	660,000	660,000
PINE FLAT LAKE	1,692,000	1,692,000
RICHMOND HARBOR	1,780,000	1,780,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL	84,000	84,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS (DEBRIS CONTROL)	674,000	674,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS (30 FOOT PROJECT)	2,037,000	2,037,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY-DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE	1,190,000	1,190,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR	1,353,000	1,353,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	2,011,000	2,011,000
SAN PABLO BAY & MARE ISLAND STRAIT	6,790,000	6,790,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
SAN RAFAEL CREEK	---	---
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN	2,024,000	2,024,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR	792,000	792,000
SANTA CRUZ HARBOR	709,000	709,000
SUCCESS LAKE	1,321,000	1,321,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL	725,000	725,000
TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH)	1,087,000	1,087,000
VENTURA MARINA	1,640,000	1,640,000
YUBA RIVER	24,000	24,000
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE	302,000	302,000
CHATFIELD LAKE	556,000	556,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE	919,000	919,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR	1,092,000	1,092,000
TRINIDAD LAKE	484,000	484,000
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE	236,000	236,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE	245,000	245,000
CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD	1,012,000	1,012,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE	156,000	156,000
HOP BROOK LAKE	540,000	540,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE	385,000	385,000
NEW HAVEN HARBOR	1,396,000	1,396,000
NEW LONDON HARBOR	699,000	699,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE	264,000	264,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER	138,000	138,000
THOMASTON DAM	514,000	514,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE	658,000	658,000
DELAWARE		
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD	12,331,000	12,331,000
IWW REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY	470,000	470,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR	4,634,000	4,634,000
DIST OF COLUMBIA		
POTOMAC & ANACOSTIA RIVER (DRIFT REMOVAL)	470,000	470,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR	29,000	29,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
FLORIDA		
APALACHICOLA BAY	17,000	17,000
BLACKWATER RIVER	38,000	38,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR	2,192,000	2,192,000
CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA	4,701,000	4,701,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR	1,260,000	1,260,000
CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL	1,303,000	1,303,000
EAST PASS CHANNEL	375,000	375,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR	1,312,000	1,312,000
INTRACOASTAL WATER, CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER TO ANCLOTE RIVER	80,000	80,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI	1,930,000	1,930,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR	4,335,000	4,335,000
LA GRANGE BAYOU	22,000	22,000
MIAMI HARBOR	1,010,000	1,010,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY	1,692,000	1,692,000
OKLAWAHA RIVER	4,000	4,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR	600,000	600,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR	1,608,000	1,608,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR	1,025,000	1,025,000
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR	549,000	549,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	2,474,000	2,474,000
ST LUCIE INLET	500,000	500,000
TAMPA HARBOR	4,465,000	4,465,000
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE	4,132,000	4,132,000
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	2,996,000	2,996,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (SAVANNAH DISTRICT)	896,000	896,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR	3,693,000	3,693,000
BUFORD DAM & LAKE SIDNEY LANIER	5,012,000	5,012,000
CARTERS LAKE	2,442,000	2,442,000
CLARKS HILL LAKE, GA & SC	5,629,000	5,629,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	5,281,000	5,281,000
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, GA & SC	3,410,000	3,410,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR	8,113,000	8,113,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA	309,000	309,000
WEST POINT LAKE, GA & AL	3,570,000	3,570,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, OAHU	65,000	65,000
NAWILIWILI HARBOR	2,000,000	2,000,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM	2,470,000	2,470,000
DWORSHAK DAM & RESERVOIR	5,529,000	5,529,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE	666,000	666,000
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR & RIVER, IL & IN	295,000	295,000
CARLYLE LAKE	2,882,000	2,882,000
CHICAGO HARBOR	890,000	890,000
CHICAGO RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	205,000	205,000
CHICAGO RIVER	2,328,000	2,328,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS	113,000	113,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION)	1,079,000	1,079,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY	19,354,000	19,354,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION	1,366,000	1,366,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE	3,684,000	3,684,000
MILL CREEK & SOUTH SLOUGH	25,000	25,000
MISS RIV BTWN MISSOURI RIV & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN, WI, & IA (MCD)	48,935,000	48,935,000
MISS RIV BTWN MO RIVER & MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD)	8,117,000	8,117,000
MOUTH OF SANGAMON RIVER	12,000	12,000
NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER	---	---
REND LAKE	2,652,000	2,652,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	900,000	900,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR	409,000	409,000
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE	439,000	439,000
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR	425,000	425,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE	393,000	393,000
CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE	459,000	459,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE	447,000	447,000
INDIANA HBR	2,000,000	2,000,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE	424,000	424,000
MONROE LAKE	364,000	364,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
PATOKA LAKE	376,000	376,000
SALAMONIE LAKE	359,000	359,000
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE	2,072,000	2,072,000
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA & NE	8,950,000	8,950,000
RATHBUN LAKE	1,868,000	1,868,000
RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK	2,313,000	2,313,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE	2,805,000	2,805,000
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE	1,257,000	1,257,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE	653,000	653,000
EL DORADO LAKE	380,000	380,000
ELK CITY LAKE	554,000	554,000
FALL RIVER LAKE	601,000	601,000
HILLSDALE LAKE	532,000	532,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM & RESERVOIR	680,000	680,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE	1,299,000	1,299,000
MARION LAKE	668,000	668,000
MELVERN LAKE	1,321,000	1,321,000
MILFORD LAKE	1,175,000	1,175,000
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE	586,000	586,000
PERRY LAKE	1,883,000	1,883,000
POMONA LAKE	985,000	985,000
TORONTO LAKE	237,000	237,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE	1,821,000	1,821,000
WILSON LAKE	1,027,000	1,027,000
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM - LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	4,427,000	4,427,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE	1,054,000	1,054,000
BUCKHORN LAKE	689,000	689,000
CARR FORK LAKE	727,000	727,000
CAVE RUN LAKE	498,000	498,000
DEWEY LAKE	668,000	668,000
FISHTRAP LAKE	684,000	684,000
GRAYSON LAKE	516,000	516,000
GREEN & BARREN RIVERS	1,591,000	1,591,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE	976,000	976,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
FUNDING DERIVED FROM PROPOSED INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND	---	-18,500,000	---	---
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		193,650,000	228,860,000	213,660,000
MAINTENANCE				
BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR AND LA	---	1,408,000	1,408,000	1,408,000
DEVALLS BLUFF PUMPING STATION, AR	---	---	200,000	---
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	703,000	703,000	703,000
MAPPING, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	603,000	603,000	603,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	10,373,000	10,373,000	10,373,000
NORTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR	---	304,000	304,000	304,000
SOUTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR	---	139,000	139,000	139,000
ST. FRANCIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AR & MO	---	4,565,000	4,565,000	4,565,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	7,615,000	7,615,000	7,615,000
BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	113,000	113,000	113,000
BONNET CARRE SPILLWAY, LA	---	342,000	342,000	342,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	14,000	14,000	14,000
OLD RIVER, LA	---	5,360,000	5,360,000	5,360,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, LA	---	733,000	733,000	733,000
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	2,362,000	2,362,000	2,362,000
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	198,000	198,000	198,000
ENID LAKE, MS	---	2,445,000	2,445,000	2,445,000
GREENWOOD, MS	---	566,000	566,000	566,000
GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	3,463,000	3,463,000	3,463,000
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	---	1,244,000	1,244,000	1,244,000
SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	2,858,000	2,858,000	2,858,000
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	2,786,000	2,786,000	2,786,000
WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS	---	1,237,000	1,237,000	1,237,000
YAZOO BACKWATER, MS	---	3,776,000	3,776,000	3,776,000
YAZOO CITY, MS	---	1,217,000	1,217,000	1,217,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	2,779,000	2,779,000	2,779,000
REVETMENT AND DIKES	---	28,752,000	28,752,000	28,752,000
DREDGING	---	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	---	1,040,000	1,040,000	1,040,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
FUNDING DERIVED FROM PROPOSED INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND	---	-14,500,000	---	---
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		90,495,000	105,195,000	104,995,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, SLIPPAGE, AND PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-20,615,000	-20,615,000	-39,215,000
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES		269,000,000	321,685,000	285,735,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
HICKMAN HARBOR	422,000	422,000
KENTUCKY RIVER	1,294,000	1,294,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE	777,000	777,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE	454,000	454,000
MIDDLESBORO	39,000	39,000
NOLIN LAKE	989,000	989,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, PA, WV, OH, IN, & IL	32,942,000	32,942,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, PA,WV, OH, IN, & IL	6,899,000	6,899,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE	452,000	452,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE	1,103,000	1,103,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE	535,000	535,000
WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND	2,873,000	2,873,000
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER & BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK	4,120,000	4,120,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY	3,180,000	3,180,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR	371,000	371,000
BAYOU PIERRE	38,000	38,000
BAYOU RIGOLETTE	10,000	10,000
BAYOU TECHE	618,000	618,000
CADDO LAKE	143,000	143,000
CALCASIEU RIVER & PASS	10,390,000	10,390,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU	729,000	729,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	10,420,000	10,420,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL	4,865,000	4,865,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR	385,000	385,000
MADISON PARISH PORT	227,000	227,000
MERMENTAU RIVER	705,000	705,000
MISS RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE	1,240,000	1,240,000
MISS RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	29,330,000	29,330,000
MISS RIVER-GULF OUTLET	4,440,000	4,440,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT	1,640,000	1,640,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	1,323,000	1,323,000
WALLACE LAKE	124,000	124,000
MAINE		
KENNEBEC RIVER	606,000	606,000
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS	14,234,000	14,234,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	225,000	225,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL.—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	81,000	81,000
BLOOMINGTON LAKE, MD & WV	981,000	981,000
CLAIBORNE HARBOR	117,000	117,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV, MD & WV	63,000	63,000
FISHING CREEK	958,000	958,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY	435,000	435,000
RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON	690,000	690,000
WICOMICO RIVER	1,090,000	1,090,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM	404,000	404,000
BIRCH HILL DAM	259,000	259,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE	339,000	339,000
CAPE COD CANAL	4,766,000	4,766,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREAS	339,000	339,000
CONANT BROOK LAKE	191,000	191,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE	257,000	257,000
GREEN HARBOR	320,000	320,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM	349,000	349,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM	363,000	363,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE	431,000	431,000
NEW BEDFORD, FAIRHAVEN & ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	130,000	130,000
TULLY LAKE	383,000	383,000
WEST HILL DAM	483,000	483,000
WESTVILLE LAKE	430,000	430,000
MICHIGAN		
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR	1,001,000	1,001,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR	182,000	182,000
DETROIT RIVER	7,581,000	7,581,000
FRANKFORT HARBOR	201,000	201,000
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR & GRAND RIVER	915,000	915,000
HAMMOND BAY HARBOR	30,000	30,000
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR	---	---
HARRISVILLE HARBOR	107,000	107,000
HOLLAND HARBOR	823,000	823,000
INLAND ROUTE	41,000	41,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY (DIKED DISPOSAL)	600,000	600,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY	741,000	741,000
LEXINGTON HARBOR	208,000	208,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR	268,000	268,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
MANISTEE HARBOR	1,221,000	1,221,000
MARQUETTE HARBOR	279,000	279,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR RIVER, MI & WI (DIKED DISPOSAL)	105,000	105,000
MONROE HARBOR	2,625,000	2,625,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR	304,000	304,000
ROUGE RIVER	1,198,000	1,198,000
SAGINAW RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	1,900,000	1,900,000
SAGINAW RIVER	2,683,000	2,683,000
SEBEWAING RIVER	24,000	24,000
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR	228,000	228,000
ST. CLAIR RIVER	1,514,000	1,514,000
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR	786,000	786,000
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	1,710,000	1,710,000
ST. MARYS RIVER	11,416,000	11,416,000
MINNESOTA		
BIG STONE LAKE AND WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	135,000	135,000
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	8,620,000	8,620,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKE	453,000	453,000
MINNESOTA RIVER	500,000	500,000
ORWELL LAKE	202,000	202,000
RED LAKE RIVER	131,000	131,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER	1,784,000	1,784,000
ST. CROIX RIVER, MN & WI	157,000	157,000
MISSISSIPPI		
ARKABUTLA LAKE	70,000	70,000
BILOXI HARBOR	1,072,000	1,072,000
CADET BAYOU	28,000	28,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT	8,000	8,000
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER	529,000	529,000
ENID LAKE	147,000	147,000
GRENADA LAKE	71,000	71,000
GULFPORT HARBOR	2,448,000	2,448,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE	906,000	906,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR	3,684,000	3,684,000
PASS CHRISTIAN HARBOR	126,000	126,000
PEARL RIVER	257,000	257,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR	261,000	261,000
SARDIS LAKE	71,000	71,000
YAZOO RIVER	77,000	77,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR	310,000	310,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM & RESERVOIR	3,917,000	3,917,000
CLEARWATER LAKE	1,327,000	1,327,000
HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	4,732,000	4,732,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE	478,000	478,000
MERAMEC PARK LAKE	613,000	613,000
MISS. RIVER BTN OHIO & MO RIVERS, MO & IL	12,203,000	12,203,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE	1,242,000	1,242,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE	738,000	738,000
STOCKTON LAKE	1,816,000	1,816,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE	3,081,000	3,081,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE	59,000	59,000
MONTANA		
FORT PECK LAKE	3,627,000	3,627,000
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA	3,654,000	3,654,000
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM LEWIS & CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	4,365,000	4,365,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE	1,393,000	1,393,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER	---	---
MISSOURI RIVER, KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, NE & IA	45,000	45,000
PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES	318,000	318,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES	476,000	476,000
NEVADA		
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	277,000	277,000
PINE & MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES	135,000	135,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM	344,000	344,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE	549,000	549,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM	628,000	628,000
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES	986,000	986,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE	363,000	363,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE	328,000	328,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
NEW JERSEY		
ABSECON INLET	150,000	150,000
BARNEGAT INLET	550,000	550,000
COLD SPRING INLET	---	---
DELAWARE RIVER BETWEEN PHILADELPHIA AND TRENTON, NJ & PA	4,052,000	4,052,000
MANASQUAN RIVER	255,000	255,000
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	2,865,000	2,865,000
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK & PASSAIC RIVERS	2,500,000	2,500,000
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM	662,000	662,000
COCHITI LAKE	1,033,000	1,033,000
CONCHAS LAKE	823,000	823,000
GALISTEO DAM	118,000	118,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM	209,000	209,000
SANTA ROSA DAM & LAKE	451,000	451,000
TWO RIVERS DAM	374,000	374,000
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE	225,000	225,000
ARKPORT DAM	121,000	121,000
BAY RIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS	1,100,000	1,100,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL & TONAWANDA HARBOR	1,835,000	1,835,000
BRONX RIVER	1,425,000	1,425,000
BUFFALO HARBOR	1,329,000	1,329,000
DUNKIRK HARBOR	58,000	58,000
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET	1,500,000	1,500,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE	213,000	213,000
GREAT SODUS BAY HARBOR	26,000	26,000
HUDSON RIVER	3,143,000	3,143,000
JAMAICA BAY	1,000,000	1,000,000
LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR	27,000	27,000
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	1,000,000	1,000,000
MT. MORRIS LAKE	1,034,000	1,034,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, NY & VT	1,135,000	1,135,000
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY & NJ	4,602,000	4,602,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	3,056,000	3,056,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	540,000	540,000
NEW YORK HARBOR	6,454,000	6,454,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
NEWTOWN CREEK	1,500,000	1,500,000
OAK ORCHARD HARBOR	26,000	26,000
OGDENSBURG HARBOR	50,000	50,000
OLCOTT HARBOR	10,000	10,000
ROCHESTER HARBOR	960,000	960,000
RONDOUT HARBOR	1,250,000	1,250,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	472,000	472,000
WESTCHESTER CREEK	1,000,000	1,000,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE	398,000	398,000
WILSON HARBOR	10,000	10,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (WILMINGTON DISTRICT)	5,721,000	5,721,000
B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM & LAKE	785,000	785,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR	340,000	340,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON	451,000	451,000
CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT	292,000	292,000
FALLS LAKE	877,000	877,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER	466,000	466,000
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY	5,289,000	5,289,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR	6,889,000	6,889,000
OCRACOKE INLET	122,000	122,000
SILVER LAKE HARBOR	80,000	80,000
W. KERR SCOTT DAM & RESERVOIR	1,114,000	1,114,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR	3,748,000	3,748,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE	152,000	152,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA	7,602,000	7,602,000
HOMME LAKE AND DAM	54,000	54,000
LAKE ASHTABULA & BALDHILL DAM	1,730,000	1,730,000
PIPESTEM LAKE	270,000	270,000
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE	459,000	459,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR	11,566,000	11,566,000
BERLIN LAKE	1,183,000	1,183,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE	577,000	577,000
CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM	387,000	387,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR	9,901,000	9,901,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
CONNEAUT HARBOR	430,000	430,000
DEER CREEK LAKE	397,000	397,000
DELAWARE LAKE	334,000	334,000
DILLON LAKE	265,000	265,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR	506,000	506,000
HURON HARBOR	797,000	797,000
LORAIN HARBOR	1,165,000	1,165,000
MASSILLON	15,000	15,000
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM & RESERVOIR	535,000	535,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE	568,000	568,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER RESERVOIRS	4,399,000	4,399,000
NEWARK	15,000	15,000
NORTH BRANCH OF KOKOSING RIVER LAKE	166,000	166,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE	476,000	476,000
ROSEVILLE	15,000	15,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR	751,000	751,000
TOLEDO HARBOR	4,594,000	4,594,000
TOM JENKINS DAM	238,000	238,000
VERMILION HARBOR	14,000	14,000
WEST FORK MILL CREEK LAKE	281,000	281,000
WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE	496,000	496,000
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE	99,000	99,000
BIRCH LAKE	551,000	551,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE	1,200,000	1,200,000
CANTON LAKE	1,870,000	1,870,000
COPAN LAKE	524,000	524,000
EUFAULA LAKE	3,432,000	3,432,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE	3,365,000	3,365,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE	601,000	601,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE	407,000	407,000
HEYBURN LAKE	532,000	532,000
HUGO LAKE (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	1,076,000	1,076,000
HULAH LAKE	557,000	557,000
KAW LAKE	1,640,000	1,640,000
KEYSTONE LAKE	2,383,000	2,383,000
OOLOGAH LAKE	1,139,000	1,139,000
OPTIMA LAKE	573,000	573,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES	7,000	7,000
PINE CREEK LAKE	713,000	713,000
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK, DAM & RESERVOIR	2,330,000	2,330,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
SARDIS LAKE	498,000	498,000
SKIATOOK LAKE	690,000	690,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE	2,414,000	2,414,000
WAURIKA LAKE	859,000	859,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK & DAM	1,834,000	1,834,000
WISTER LAKE	536,000	536,000
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE	455,000	455,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE	166,000	166,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM, LAKE BONNEVILLE, OR & WA	13,422,000	13,422,000
CHETCO RIVER	602,000	602,000
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE RIVS BELOW VANCVR & PORT, OR & WA	14,263,000	14,263,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	5,295,000	5,295,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES	429,000	429,000
COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS	114,000	114,000
COOS BAY	3,382,000	3,382,000
COQUILLE RIVER	442,000	442,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE	638,000	638,000
COUGAR LAKE	1,178,000	1,178,000
DEPOE BAY	27,000	27,000
DETROIT LAKE	1,534,000	1,534,000
DORENA LAKE	347,000	347,000
FALL CREEK LAKE	259,000	259,000
FERN RIDGE DAM & LAKE	905,000	905,000
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES	2,050,000	2,050,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE	607,000	607,000
JOHN DAY LOCK & DAM, OR & WA	13,741,000	13,741,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE	2,161,000	2,161,000
LOST CREEK LAKE	2,104,000	2,104,000
MCNARY LOCK & DAM, LAKE WALLULA, OR & WA	11,916,000	11,916,000
PORT ORFORD	218,000	218,000
ROGUE RIVER HARBOR AT GOLD BEACH	490,000	490,000
SIUSLAW RIVER	536,000	536,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL	332,000	332,000
TILLAMOOK BAY & BAR	59,000	59,000
UMPQUA RIVER	865,000	865,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS	486,000	486,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AND WILLAMETTE FALLS	176,000	176,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE	95,000	95,000
YAQUINA BAY & HARBOR	757,000	757,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER	4,980,000	4,980,000
ALVIN R. BUSH DAM	305,000	305,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE	104,000	104,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE	582,000	582,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE	1,086,000	1,086,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE	800,000	800,000
COWANESQUE LAKE	893,000	893,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE	750,000	750,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE	379,000	379,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, PA, NJ & DE	19,592,000	19,592,000
EAST BRANCH, CLARION RIVER LAKE	512,000	512,000
ERIE HARBOR	415,000	415,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM	386,000	386,000
FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM	468,000	468,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM	294,000	294,000
JOHNSTOWN	7,000	7,000
KINZUA DAM & ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA & NY	937,000	937,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE	800,000	800,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE	449,000	449,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA & WV	13,225,000	13,225,000
PROMPTON LAKE	286,000	286,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY	7,000	7,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE	2,025,000	2,025,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER	2,015,000	2,015,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA & OH	1,447,000	1,447,000
STILLWATER LAKE	176,000	176,000
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES	1,342,000	1,342,000
TIONESTA LAKE	870,000	870,000
UNION CITY LAKE	304,000	304,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE	561,000	561,000
YORK, INDIAN ROCK DAM	296,000	296,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	1,373,000	1,373,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT)	477,000	477,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR	4,795,000	4,795,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR	3,548,000	3,548,000
FOLLY RIVER	236,000	236,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR	2,501,000	2,501,000
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	23,000	23,000
MURRELLS INLET	27,000	27,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
PORT ROYAL HARBOR	614,000	614,000
SHIPYARD RIVER	632,000	632,000
TOWN CREEK	288,000	288,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE	4,607,000	4,607,000
COLD BROOK LAKE	150,000	150,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE	144,000	144,000
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE	6,114,000	6,114,000
LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX RIVER, SD & MN	245,000	245,000
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	7,286,000	7,286,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE	2,163,000	2,163,000
CHEATHAM LOCK & DAM	3,152,000	3,152,000
CORDELL HULL DAM & RESERVOIR	2,213,000	2,213,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN & KY	2,593,000	2,593,000
J. PERCY PRIEST DAM & RESERVOIR	1,839,000	1,839,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK & DAM	3,042,000	3,042,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN, AL, & KY	9,714,000	9,714,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR	574,000	574,000
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE	469,000	469,000
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL (AREA 8)	383,000	383,000
BARDWELL LAKE	873,000	873,000
BELTON LAKE	1,378,000	1,378,000
BENBROOK LAKE	1,263,000	1,263,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR	1,440,000	1,440,000
BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	729,000	729,000
CANYON LAKE	1,073,000	1,073,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	4,880,000	4,880,000
DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX & OK	4,044,000	4,044,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O' THE PINES	1,975,000	1,975,000
FREEPORT HARBOR	2,210,000	2,210,000
GALVESTON HARBOR & CHANNEL	6,365,000	6,365,000
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE	708,000	708,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE	1,372,000	1,372,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	12,380,000	12,380,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE	879,000	879,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL	6,330,000	6,330,000
JOE POOL LAKE	268,000	268,000
LAKE KEMP	154,000	154,000
LAVON LAKE	1,861,000	1,861,000
LEWISVILLE DAM	2,001,000	2,001,000
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL	2,730,000	2,730,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE	936,000	936,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN	852,000	852,000
O. C. FISHER DAM & LAKE	584,000	584,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE	642,000	642,000
PROCTOR LAKE	925,000	925,000
RAY ROBERTS LAKE	96,000	96,000
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY	6,900,000	6,900,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM & RESERVOIR	2,547,000	2,547,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE	1,675,000	1,675,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM	1,072,000	1,072,000
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL	2,480,000	2,480,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM & B.A. STEINHAGEN LAKE	811,000	811,000
WACO LAKE	1,673,000	1,673,000
WALLISVILLE PROJECT-TRINITY RIVER	245,000	245,000
WHITNEY LAKE	2,918,000	2,918,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM & LAKE	1,608,000	1,608,000
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE	329,000	329,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE	398,000	398,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE	437,000	437,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE	478,000	478,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM	306,000	306,000
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	2,245,000	2,245,000
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS	1,625,000	1,625,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET	1,243,000	1,243,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW	965,000	965,000
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	190,000	190,000
JAMES RIVER	2,186,000	2,186,000
JOHN H. KERR DAM & RESERVOIR, VA & NC	5,009,000	5,009,000
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM & RESERVOIR	633,000	633,000
NORFOLK HARBOR	6,525,000	6,525,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)...	270,000	270,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND LAKE.....	258,000	258,000
PHILPOTT LAKE.....	1,367,000	1,367,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA.....	1,138,000	1,138,000
YORK RIVER.....	300,000	300,000
WASHINGTON		
ANACORTES HARBOR.....	160,000	160,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM.....	6,533,000	6,533,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR.....	325,000	325,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK, WA, AND HEAD OF SAND ISLAND.....	233,000	233,000
EDIZ HOOK.....	10,000	10,000
EVERETT HARBOR & SNOHOMISH RIVER.....	625,000	625,000
GRAYS HARBOR & CHEHALIS RIVER.....	4,490,000	4,490,000
HOWARD A. HANSON RESERVOIR.....	677,000	677,000
ICE HARBOR LOCK & DAM.....	5,248,000	5,248,000
KENMORE NAVIGATION CHANNEL.....	205,000	205,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL.....	3,247,000	3,247,000
LEWIS RIVER.....	64,000	64,000
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK & DAM, LAKE BRYAN.....	3,997,000	3,997,000
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA & ID.....	7,256,000	7,256,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK & DAM.....	3,884,000	3,884,000
MILL CREEK LAKE.....	515,000	515,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM.....	1,299,000	1,299,000
PUGET SOUND & ITS TRIBUTARY WATERS.....	765,000	765,000
SEATTLE HARBOR.....	515,000	515,000
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER.....	110,000	110,000
SWINOMISH CHANNEL.....	335,000	335,000
TACOMA - PUYALLUP RIVER.....	40,000	40,000
THE DALLES LOCK & DAM, LAKE CELILO, WA & OR.....	6,307,000	6,307,000
WYNOOCHEE LAKE.....	1,007,000	1,007,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE.....	545,000	545,000
BLUESTONE LAKE.....	734,000	734,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE.....	815,000	815,000
EAST LYNN LAKE.....	755,000	755,000
ELKINS.....	6,000	6,000
KANAWHA RIVER.....	8,242,000	8,242,000
R. D. BAILEY LAKE.....	929,000	929,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE	1,295,000	1,295,000
SUTTON LAKE	1,398,000	1,398,000
TYGART RIVER LAKE	893,000	893,000
WISCONSIN		
ASHLAND HARBOR	349,000	349,000
EAU GALLE RIVER	347,000	347,000
FOX RIVER	1,008,000	1,008,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR	1,744,000	1,744,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	8,000,000	8,000,000
KENOSHA HARBOR	434,000	434,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR	1,613,000	1,613,000
LAFARGE LAKE	203,000	203,000
MANITOWOC HARBOR	156,000	156,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR	5,772,000	5,772,000
RACINE HARBOR	178,000	178,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR	538,000	538,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	270,000	270,000
STURGEON BAY & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL	638,000	638,000
STURGEON BAY & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL (DIKED DISPOSAL)	190,000	190,000
MISCELLANEOUS		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	5,291,000	5,291,000
INSPECTION OF NON-FEDERAL LEVEES	910,000	910,000
SCHEDULING FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	2,019,000	2,019,000
MONITOR COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	1,200,000	1,000,000
RIVER ICE MANAGEMENT	4,000,000	3,000,000
REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION RESEARCH (REMR)	8,195,000	7,500,000
PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION		
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS AND OBSTRUCTIONS	2,307,000	2,307,000
PROTECTION, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	200,000	100,000
GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS	51,000,000	49,500,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	7,682,000	7,682,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	2,568,000	2,000,000
COMMERCIAL STATISTICS	2,890,000	2,890,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
MOBILIZATION PLANNING.....	13,300,000	9,900,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-9,000,000	-15,241,000
FUNDING DERIVED FROM PROPOSED INLAND WATERWAYS AND RIVER AND HARBORS TRUST FUNDS.....	-355,000,000	---
TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.....	961,000,000	1,302,800,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP) SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC) SPECIAL
(COMP) COMPREHENSIVE
(PHASE I) AUTHORIZD FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

REVOLVING FUND

Appropriations 1985	.....
Budget estimate, 1986	$7,000,000
House allowance	7,000,000
Committee recommendation	7,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	.....
House allowance	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,000,000, which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The fund provides for the acquisition, operation, and maintenance of plant and equipment used in civil works functions; for temporary financing of services chargeable to civil appropriations; and for furnishing facilities and services for military functions of the Department of the Army, other governmental agencies and private persons (33 U.S.C. 576).

The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 to initiate construction of a dustpan dredge and $5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers Automation Plan as requested in the budget.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations 1985	$112,000,000
Budget estimate, 1986	107,000,000
House allowance	107,000,000
Committee recommendation	107,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	.....
House allowance	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $107,000,000, which is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the division offices, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

GENERAL

Missouri River mainstem reservoir water withdrawals.—The Secretary of the Army is directed not to require any payment for waters withdrawn by a State, or its political subdivisions, or by a nonprofit entity, for municipal or industrial uses within the State for withdrawal from any Missouri River mainstem reservoir if the existence of the mainstem reservoir involved will not enhance the dependability of the withdrawal under conditions of 100 year, 7 day low flow in the Missouri River.

Jacksonville Harbor Navigation Channel, FL.—The Committee is concerned with the safe movement of vessels negotiating the turn at Fulton-Dame Point Cut and the Blount Island West Channel, Jacksonville Harbor; and recommends a provision in the bill which would allow the Corps of Engineers to remove obstructions and ease bends in the interest of safe navigation.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1985	$35,566,000
Budget estimate, 1986	32,050,000
House allowance	34,085,000
Committee recommendation	32,150,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+100,000
House allowance	−1,935,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $32,150,000, which is $100,000 over the budget request, $1,935,000 below the House allowance, and $3,416,000 below the current funding level.

Ground Water Recharge Demonstration Program.—The Committee notes that the House has included several site specific ground water demonstration projects in its fiscal year 1986 recommendation.

The Ground Water Recharge Demonstration Program authorized by Public Law 98–434, directs the Secretary of the Interior to carryout a specific two-phased program: Phase I, the planning, development, and site selection; and phase II, the design construction, data gathering, and evaluation phase. Further, the legislation established specific criteria and procedures for the selection of the demonstration projects under phase I and subsequent construction and operation under phase II.

The Committee feels that it is premature to identify specific sites without the benefit of detailed plans and cost estimates. Therefore, the Committee has deleted, without prejudice, the sites included by the House, and has provided $500,000, the full amount authorized for phase I activities. The Committee expects the Bureau of Reclamation to move as expeditiously as possible to complete phase I planning and site selection.

Seminoe Dam modification, Wyoming.—Within available funds, the Bureau of Reclamation is hereby directed to use up to $100,000 to analyze the potential of enlarging Seminoe Dam and Reservoir under the authority contained in Public Law 92–199 for the purposes of irrigation, municipal and industrial water, and available storage.

Rathdrum, ID, sump system.—The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to use $50,000 of available funds to undertake an appraisal level study of an acceptable sump system for the city of Rathdrum, ID.

Atmospheric Water Resources Management Program.—Within the amount recommended for this program, the Committee has included $400,000 for the Sierra cooperative pilot studies of effects of cloud seeding; $500,000 to continue the university research grant related to cloud seeding and pilot training; and $600,000 for the Southwest Cooperative Operational Demonstration Program-southwest drought rain augmentation research.

Hydroelectric environmental management study.—The Committee recommends that up to $500,000 of available funds be used to undertake studies to evaluate the extent to which hydroelectric dams and pump storage facilities can be used to manage environmental concerns along the Colorado River.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and activities are shown in the following table:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ARIZONA				
PIMA COUNTY/SANTA CRUZ GROUND WATER PROJECT	PROJ.INV.	---	100,000	---
SPRING CANYON PUMPED STORAGE PROJECT	PROJ.INV.	240,000	240,000	240,000
CALIFORNIA				
ALL AMERICAN CANAL RELOCATION	ADV.PLNG.	300,000	300,000	300,000
CENTRAL VALLEY:				
DELTA DIVISION, KELLOGG UNIT REFORMULATION	PROJ.INV.	68,000	68,000	68,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT STUDY	SP.INV.	487,000	487,000	487,000
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE STUDY	PROJ.INV.	743,000	743,000	743,000
CROSS DELTA CONSTRICTION INVESTIGATION	PROJ.INV.	250,000	250,000	250,000
DELTA SUPPORT STUDIES	PROJ.INV.	322,000	322,000	322,000
IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT CANAL LINING AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	PROJ.INV.	200,000	200,000	200,000
LOWER COLORADO WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	ADV.PLNG.	160,000	160,000	160,000
OFFSTREAM STORAGE	PROJ.INV.	150,000	150,000	150,000
REFUGE WATER SUPPLY	PROJ.INV.	80,000	80,000	80,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
COLORADO				
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON POWERPLANT	PROJ.INV.	140,000	140,000	140,000
CRWQIP, LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT	ADV.PLNG.	220,000	220,000	220,000
HIGH MOUNTAIN AQUIFER STUDY	PROJ.INV.	100,000	100,000	100,000
MESA-DELTA M&I GROUNDWATER STUDY	SP.INV.-M&I	515,000	515,000	515,000
PROGRAM RELATED ENGINEERING AND SCIENTIFIC STUDIES		4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
IDAHO				
OAKLEY FAN GROUNDWATER & RECHARGE INVESTIGATION	PROJ.INV.	150,000	150,000	150,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT,NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIVISION EXTEN	PROJ.INV.-I	50,000	50,000	50,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT,NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIVISION EXTEN	ADV.PLNG.	225,000	225,000	225,000
KANSAS				
KANSAS RIVER BASIN WATER OPERATIONS STUDY	PROJ.INV.	115,000	115,000	115,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
MONTANA				
MILK RIVER WATER SUPPLY UNIT (P-SMBP) (FORMERLY MARIAS-MILK UNIT) (P-SMBP)	ADV.PLNG.	140,000	140,000	140,000
NEBRASKA				
LOUP RIVER BASIN STUDY	SP.INV.	---	100,000	---
PLATTE RIVER WATER USE OPTIONS (P-SMBP)	SP.INV.	77,000	77,000	77,000
PRAIRIE BEND UNIT (P-SMBP)	PROJ.INV.-I	245,000	245,000	245,000
NEVADA				
DEEP-CARBONATE AQUIFER	PROJ.INV.-P	750,000	750,000	750,000
NEW MEXICO				
ALAMOGORDO M&I WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PROJ.INV.-M&I	200,000	200,000	200,000
DITCH EVALUATIONS OF RIO GRANDE (3 TRIBUTARIES)	SP.INV.	---	100,000	---
GALLUP - NAVAJO INDIAN WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	PROJ.INV.	---	200,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
POJOAQUE VALLEY CONJUNCTIVE GROUND WATER/SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	PROJ.INV.	---	150,000	---
RIO CHAMA COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT, RIO ARRIBA COUNTY	SP.INV.	---	50,000	---
TAOS COMMUNITY DITCH EVALUATION	SP.INV.-I	30,000	30,000	30,000
OKLAHOMA				
EAST CENTRAL OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PROJ.INV.-M&I	200,000	300,000	200,000
KIAMICHI HYDROPOWER STUDY	PROJ.INV.-P	225,000	300,000	225,000
NORTHWEST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PROJ.INV.-M&I	185,000	185,000	185,000
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PROJ.INV.-M&I	240,000	300,000	240,000
OREGON				
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT	PROJ.INV.	125,000	125,000	250,000
UMPQUA RIVER BASIN WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT INVEST	PROJ.INV.	170,000	170,000	170,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1985	$740,000,000
Budget estimate, 1986	532,430,000
House allowance	541,074,000
Committee recommendation	512,730,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−19,700,000
House allowance	−28,344,000

A new appropriation of $512,730,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is $19,700,000 below the budget request.

Central Arizona project.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $183,500,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request for 1986.

The Committee again wishes to express its commitment to the CAP and particularly those activities necessary to provide water service to the Tucson metropolitan area.

Further, the Committee understands that the Bureau of Reclamation has indicated that additional funds beyond the amount recommended could possibly be used on the project. With this in mind, the Committee has provided sufficient flexibility that, if warranted, additional funds can be reprogrammed for use.

The Committee expects the Bureau to move forward as expeditiously as possible to insure timely completion of the Tucson aqueduct and to request reprogramming authority if needed.

Teton Dam failure-payment of claims.—The Committee has been informed that there is an unobligated balance of $22,000,000 available for payment of claims as a result of the Teton Dam failure, with three claims still pending totaling $8,000,000. The Committee has applied the balance, $14,000,000, for use on projects under the construction appropriation.

Lake Audubon, ND.—The Committee is aware of increased ground water levels in eastern McLean County, ND, around Lake Audubon. The Bureau of Reclamation shall, if appropriate, provide affected interests flood flowage easements until the problem is corrected. Furthermore, the Bureau of Reclamation is instructed to work with the Corps of Engineers, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the State water commission, and local water resource districts to find an acceptable solution as expeditiously as possible.

The amounts recommended by the Committee are shown on the following table along with the budget request and House allowance:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTH DAKOTA				
CENTRAL SOUTH DAKOTA WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM(CENDAK).....	ADV.PLNG.	1,775,000	1,775,000	1,775,000
SOUTH DAKOTA WATER DELIVERIES STUDY (P-SMBP).....	PROJ.INV.-I,M&I	50,000	50,000	50,000
TEXAS				
TEXAS BASIN, BEDIAS PROJECT.....	PROJ.INV.	395,000	395,000	395,000
TEXAS BASIN, TEXAS BIG SANDY PROJECT.....	PROJ.INV.	320,000	320,000	320,000
TEXAS BASIN, COLORADO COASTAL PLAINS PROJECT.....	ADV.PLNG.	600,000	600,000	600,000
TEXAS BASIN, SAN JACINTO PROJECT.....	PROJ.INV.-M&I	275,000	275,000	275,000
UTAH				
CRSP POWER PEAKING CAPACITY.....	PROJ.INV.-P	50,000	50,000	50,000
WASATCH FRONT TOTAL WATER MANAGEMENT.....	SP.INV.-M&I	240,000	240,000	240,000
WASHINGTON				
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.....	PROJ.INV.-I	277,000	277,000	277,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
WYOMING				
BLUE HOLES RESERVOIR	PROJ.INV.	150,000	150,000	150,000
CRWQIP, BIG SANDY RIVER UNIT	ADV.PLNG.	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
WESTSIDE IRRIGATION PROJECT	PROJ.INV.-I	100,000	100,000	100,000
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	PROJ.INV.	4,195,000	4,195,000	4,195,000
CRWQIP, SAN JUAN RIVER UNIT	PROJ.INV.	223,000	223,000	223,000
GENERAL ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH:				
ATMOSPHERIC WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM		5,000,000	6,100,000	5,000,000
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	PROJ.INV.	325,000	325,000	500,000
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS:				
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORD. ACTIVITIES	SP.INV.	3,635,000	3,635,000	3,435,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	SP.INV.	420,000	420,000	420,000
INVESTIGATIONS OF EXISTING PROJECTS	SP.INV.	158,000	158,000	158,000
MINOR WORK IN CONNECTION WITH COMPLETED PROJ.INVEST.	SP.INV.	535,000	535,000	535,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	SP.INV.	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...		-1,175,000	-1,175,000	-1,175,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....		32,050,000	34,085,000	32,150,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
ARIZONA					
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT (BIA).....	58,100,000	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	---
CALIFORNIA					
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:					
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	345,662,000	296,964,000	5,362,000	5,362,000	5,362,000
SAN LUIS UNIT.....	1,228,496,000	478,782,000	12,490,000	12,490,000	12,490,000
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.....	2,060,807,000	338,135,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	884,492,000	849,168,000	1,063,000	1,063,000	1,063,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION.....	304,860,000	252,098,000	37,597,000	37,597,000	37,597,000
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION.....	---	---	---	500,000	500,000
COLORADO					
NARROWS UNIT (P-SMBP).....	403,784,000	7,326,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II,CRBSCP.....	182,172,000	45,348,000	3,505,000	3,505,000	3,505,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	84,377,000	15,659,000	1,782,000	1,782,000	1,782,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION.....	77,292,000	40,029,000	9,785,000	9,785,000	9,785,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
NEBRASKA					
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP	352,400,000	145,644,000	21,749,000	26,749,000	21,749,000
O'NEILL UNIT, P-SMBP	382,550,000	7,247,000	240,000	240,000	240,000
NEVADA					
LAS VEGAS WASH UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	122,502,000	9,884,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
NEW MEXICO					
BRANTLEY PROJECT	162,919,000	65,827,000	29,536,000	29,536,000	29,536,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT	15,792,000	4,580,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
NORTH DAKOTA					
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	1,229,380,000	256,070,000	41,300,000	41,300,000	41,300,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
OKLAHOMA					
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	110,574,000	85,814,000	6,645,000	7,645,000	6,645,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
WEB RURAL WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	85,741,000	18,500,000	18,525,000	18,525,000	18,525,000
TEXAS					
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	96,737,000	91,301,000	4,834,000	4,834,000	4,834,000
WASHINGTON					
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT	76,000,000	60,483,000	7,225,000	7,225,000	7,225,000
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:					
IRRIGATION FACILITIES	3,450,451,000	905,580,000	6,535,000	7,535,000	6,535,000
THIRD POWERPLANT	751,500,000	673,376,000	12,894,000	12,894,000	12,894,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE & PROTECTIVE FACILITIES	19,825,000	1,000,000	4,353,000	4,353,000	4,353,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1985	$149,689,000
Budget estimate, 1986	132,665,000
House allowance	132,665,000
Committee recommendation	132,665,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $132,665,000, which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The fiscal year 1986 budget provides for operation and maintenance and associated work on 33 projects. The program also provides for the negotiation and administration of water marketing contracts; soil and moisture conservation; flood control operations at a number of water user operated reservoirs; water management and construction; and examination of existing structures.

The Committee concurs with the House action restoring bill language which provides for readvances to the Colorado River Dam Fund for the replacement program at Hoover Dam and Powerplant, adjusted to provide that the amount readvanced shall be repaid at the interest rate determined pursuant to section 104(a)(5) of Public Law 98–381. This will permit funding of essential work on the Boulder Canyon project and will require that the amounts readvanced be repaid to the Treasury at current Treasury interest rates.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1985	$67,537,000
Budget estimate, 1986	41,415,000
House allowance	42,515,000
Committee recommendation	39,315,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−2,100,000
House allowance	−3,200,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $39,315,000. This is $3,200,000 below the House allowance and $2,100,000 below the budget request.

This appropriation provides for loans to non-Federal organizations for construction and rehabilitation of distribution systems and for loans and grants to construct small irrigation projects.

The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was enacted for the purpose of encouraging local participation by qualified organizations in the development of small reclamation projects and to provide Federal assistance in the development of similar projects by non-Federal organizations.

The Committee has included all of those loans which have been approved and transmitted to the Congress as provided by law. The construction of the projects funded in the 1986 appropriations bill will use up all of the remaining unallocated ceiling under the existing $600,000,000 authorized by law. It is the Committee's understanding that if any additional projects are to be undertaken in the future, legislation will have to be enacted to raise the appropriations ceiling.

United Water Conservation District, CA.—The Committee has deleted, without prejudice, the funds included by the House for the United Water Conservation District loan because the loan has not cleared the required approval process and there is insufficient appropriation ceiling available. If, after final approval is obtained and the Secretary of the Interior certifies that sufficient ceiling exists, the Committee expects the Bureau of Reclamation to forward a reprogramming request for consideration.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
WYOMING					
BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP.....	70,700,000	4,899,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	---
VARIOUS					
BOULDER CANYON PROJECT.....	34,172,000	3,200,000	1,430,000	1,430,000	1,430,000
MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM, TITLE I, CRBSCP.....	491,356,000	270,970,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
ARBUCKLE PROJECT, OKLAHOMA.....	3,560,000	445,000	230,000	500,000	230,000
BOISE PROJECT, ARROWROCK DIVISION, IDAHO.....	6,640,000	350,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO.....	30,517,000	27,970,000	230,000	230,000	230,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, MANSON UNIT, WASHINGTON.....	17,729,000	17,714,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK&LEVEE SYSTEM,AR.,CO.,NV...	161,523,000	28,301,000	17,371,000	17,371,000	17,371,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES ACTIVITIES.....	1,595,000	---	327,000	327,000	327,000
FRYINGPAN ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO.....	489,512,000	480,462,000	6,034,000	6,034,000	6,034,000
GILA PROJECT, ARIZONA-CALIFORNIA.....	78,115,000	75,683,000	1,997,000	1,997,000	1,997,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA.....	50,147,000	38,437,000	1,822,000	1,822,000	1,822,000
MISCELLANEOUS ENGINEERING SERVICES, COLORADO.....	462,000	410,000	10,000	10,000	10,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	42,339,000	42,139,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA	22,773,000	3,927,000	553,000	553,000	553,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TEXAS	72,766,000	72,266,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
UNITS OR DIVISIONS, PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:					
BOSTWICK DIVISION, NEBRASKA	57,506,000	53,308,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
CANYON FERRY UNIT, MONTANA	17,057,000	15,165,000	1,770,000	1,770,000	1,770,000
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA	24,230,000	23,316,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA	42,836,000	40,298,000	230,000	230,000	230,000
OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA	490,000,000	42,032,000	65,000	65,000	65,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING	7,010,000	6,697,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
RIVERTON UNIT, WYOMING	45,630,000	45,360,000	270,000	270,000	270,000
RECREATION FACILITIES AT EXISTING RESERVOIRS	172,000	---	172,000	172,000	172,000
ROBERT B. GRIFFITH WATER PROJECT, NEVADA	171,969,000	171,619,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT, FOSS DAM, OKLAHOMA	32,784,000	32,684,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	353,088,000	40,589,000	407,000	407,000	407,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION			33,093,000	33,363,000	33,093,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:					
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT, COLORADO	1,882,000	250,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000
HEART BUTTE UNIT, HEART BUTTE DAM,N.DAKOTA(P-SMBP)	4,260,000	100,000	960,000	960,000	960,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
LEWISTON ORCHARDS, SOLDIERS MEADOW, IDAHO.....	1,025,000	---	600,000	600,000	600,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, IDAHO-WYOMING...	82,000,000	6,861,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
NAVAJO UNIT, CRSP, COLORADO-NEW MEXICO.....	7,550,000	---	3,536,000	3,536,000	3,536,000
RAPID VALLEY UNIT,PACTOLA DAM,SOUTH DAKOTA(P-SMBP)..	9,350,000	1,550,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA.....	41,985,000	574,000	600,000	2,200,000	600,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, THEODORE ROOSEVELT DAM, ARIZONA.	---	---	---	5,000,000	2,000,000
SEEDSKADEE, FONTENELLE DAM, CRSP, WYOMING.....	52,000,000	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT, ALTUS DAM, OKLAHOMA.....	2,700,000	200,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.....	4,175,000	1,924,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY...	40,423,000	14,387,000	6,164,000	6,164,000	6,164,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS.....			28,035,000	34,635,000	30,035,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:					
CROOKED RIVER, OCHOCO IRRIG. DISTRICT, OREGON.....	1,300,000	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
OKANOGAN PROJECT, OKANOGAN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA..	11,669,000	8,743,000	1,357,000	1,357,000	1,357,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT,ROOSEVELT WTR. CONSV. DIST.,AR...	9,980,000	3,402,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, HEART MOUNTAIN DIVISION, WYOMING..	5,500,000	3,587,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT, UTAH.....	7,512,000	4,053,000	2,243,000	2,243,000	2,243,000
SUN RIVER PROJECT, FT. SHAW DIVISION, MONTANA.....	1,500,000	200,000	290,000	290,000	290,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT, COLORADO	5,640,000	3,613,000	650,000	660,000	660,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, YAKIMA-TIETON IRRIG. DIST.,WA	67,332,000	62,669,000	1,160,000	1,160,000	1,160,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT OF EXISTING PROJECTS			6,910,000	6,710,000	6,910,000
TOTAL,CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION			335,363,000	349,733,000	[illegible]
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS					
COLORADO					
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PARTICIPATING PROJECT, COLO. & N.M.	543,096,000	---	---	2,000,000	---
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT	108,264,000	95,155,000	5,604,000	5,604,000	5,604,000
DOLORES PROJECT	393,175,000	224,649,000	24,440,000	24,440,000	24,440,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UTAH					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT.....	1,580,199,000	584,406,000	62,304,000	62,304,000	62,304,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT.....	75,260,000	58,791,000	1,516,000	1,516,000	1,516,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT.....	150,130,000	5,802,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UPALCO UNIT.....	89,617,000	11,686,000	2,612,000	2,612,000	2,612,000
VARIOUS					
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
UNITS:					
MODIFICATIONS & ADDITIONS TO COMPLETED FACILITIES.	22,765,000	13,829,000	686,000	686,000	686,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:					
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.....	171,871,000	96,925,000	4,570,000	4,570,000	4,570,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES.....	180,171,000	47,554,000	1,155,000	1,155,000	1,155,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT.....			103,137,000	103,137,000	103,137,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT					
ARIZONA					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS....	271,289,000	49,078,000	38,800,000	47,004,000	41,800,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA-WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF).....	3,363,421,000	1,392,193,000	134,700,000	147,200,000	141,700,000
VARIOUS					
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	---	-79,570,000	-94,000,000	-86,770,000
APPLICATION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS FROM TETON DAM CLAIMS.....	---	---	---	-14,000,000	-14,000,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.....			532,430,000	541,074,000	512,730,000

LOAN PROGRAM

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriations, 1985	($68,500,000)
Budget estimate, 1986	(40,000,000)
House allowance	(41,100,000)
Committee recommendation	(37,900,000)
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	(−2,100,000)
House allowance	(−3,200,000)

The Committee recommends a loan limitation of $37,900,000, which is $2,100,000 below the budget request.

The limitation provides a control over the principal amount of loans that may be made under the Loan Program in fiscal year 1986.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1985	$58,917,000
Budget estimate, 1986	49,200,000
House allowance	49,200,000
Committee recommendation	49,200,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $49,200,000, which is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the Reclamation Program as performed by the Department, Denver regional and other offices in the seven regions.

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriations, 1985	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1986	1,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,000,000, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

This fund is used to assure continuous operation of all projects and project facilities governed by the Federal reclamation law in the event of drought, canal bank failures, electrical system failures, municipal and industrial water delivery system failures, or other emergencies. Because of excessively high emergency requirements resulting from contamination problems at Kesterson Reservoir in fiscal year 1985, it is expected that all prior year emergency funds will be committed.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommends bill language, the same that was included in the budget request, to establish a Working Capital Fund in order to help provide for more efficient financing and financial manage-

ment of certain activities of the Bureau of Reclamation. This is similar to the revolving fund of the Corps of Engineers.

The activities which would be financed by the proposed Working Capital Fund are of the type well suited for financing by such a procedure. They are continuous, to a degree independent of program considerations, and are provided to many users.

The fund would provide a number of other advantages. Equipment, materials, and supplies could be procured at times when prices are reasonable. The inducement to year-end buying would be removed and equipment, in some cases, could be purchased rather than leased resulting in lower overall costs.

Financing activities of this nature through a single source, such as a Working Capital Fund, customarily fosters more effective and economical management. The Committee hopes that establishment of such funds would slightly reduce the annual appropriations requirement since full costs would be recovered from users and all fund revenues would be available without appropriation. No additional personnel would be needed.

The Committee expects the Bureau of Reclamation to keep the Committees on Appropriations fully informed on the status of the fund.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in the bill provide for Department of Energy programs relating to energy supply, research, and development activities; uranium supply and enrichment activities; general science and research activities; atomic energy defense activities; departmental administration; power marketing activities; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the Geothermal Resources Development Fund.

Energy Supply, Research, and Development Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1985	$1,708,908,000
Budget estimate, 1986	1,743,070,000
House allowance	1,515,210,000
Committee recommendation	1,656,620,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−86,450,000
House allowance	+141,410,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1985	$248,881,000
Budget estimate, 1986	226,101,000
House allowance	215,226,000
Committee recommendation	231,101,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+5,000,000
House allowance	+15,875,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,879,721,000 for energy supply, research, and development activities. The purpose of these funds is to support the development of new energy technologies and improve the efficiency of existing technologies. Included are the development and demonstration of solar energy, wind, ocean systems, biomass, geothermal, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems, and energy storage. Efforts associated with basic energy sciences and environmental research are also included.

SOLAR ENERGY

Although the administration does not propose major reductions from the fiscal year 1985 level of funding for solar and renewable energy activities, the request would continue the downward trend in these programs which have been substantially curtailed over the last 4 years. As

in the past, the technology development would be focused on long-term research and development.

The Committee agrees that the marketplace must ultimately decide the future role of the solar technologies. Most solar and renewables research, however, has not been developed to the point where the private sector alone can be expected to carry forward with its development.

The Committee considers it essential that a viable solar and renewable energy research and development program be maintained in the Department of Energy and that the staff expertise be maintained to properly manage this type of effort. Continued basic research and development of solar and renewable energy is essential to maintain a balanced energy research program.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends continuation of program funds and staffing levels to carry out this basic research activity. The Committee recommendation for solar energy is $161,732,000, which is $17,079,000 below funding from this year and $14,700,000 above the level of the budget request.

Solar building systems.—The Committee recommends $9,500,000 for solar building energy research, the same as the budget request and $1,000,000 over the House allowance. The budget request for this program combines basic and applied research activities formerly carried out in the Active and Passive Solar Program.

The recommendation includes $1,000,000 for a building systems test facility in the Southeast to address cooling issues in hot climates using full-scale single- and multifamily prototypes. In addition, up to $900,000 shall be available for technology transfer activities.

The recommendation includes an addition of $400,000 for open-cycle solar cooling research.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The recommendation includes $47,800,000 for photovoltaic energy systems, which is $4,200,000 over the budget request and $8,805,000 below fiscal year 1985. This recommended funding will provide approximately level funding for operating expenses and will continue the highest priority requirements needed to continue progress in reducing costs and improving efficiencies of photovoltaic systems.

As in the past years, the Committee expects the Department to maintain a balanced program of advanced research, materials research, technology development, and systems development. The increased funding will also provide for the continued operation of the residential experiment stations.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The Committee recommends $28,400,000 for solar thermal energy, the same as the budget request and $3,820,000 below the fiscal year 1985 level.

Biofuels energy systems.—The Committee recommends $28,400,000 for the biofuels program in fiscal year 1986, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance. The recommendation adopts the structure proposed which combines activities in the areas of biomass, alcohol fuels, and urban waste into one budget category.

The Committee supports the Department's decision to consolidate urban waste research and development program activities within the biofuels program. However, in order to maintain urban waste program viability, the Committee specifically includes a minimum of $5,000,000 for municipal waste R&D activities within the biofuels program.

The Committee provides $4,000,000, the same as last year, to continue the regional biomass energy programs, similar to the successful effort at the Bonneville Power Administration. In addition to providing support for activities at BPA and TVA, the Department shall carry out programs in other regions of the country, particularly in the Midwest and Southwest region. These regional programs include activities related to technology transfer, industry support, resource assessment, and matching local resources to conversion technologies.

Wind energy systems.—The recommendation provides $27,800,000 for wind energy systems, an increase of $7,000,000 over the budget request and $1,080,000 below the fiscal year 1985 funding level. The wind program should continue to focus research, test, and evaluation on small, intermediate, and large wind systems.

In the large wind machine program, the Committee believes it is important to continue the MOD–5 program in order to obtain the maximum benefits from earlier investments. Accordingly, the Committee provides an additional $9,500,000 in fiscal year 1986 funding for MOD–5 activities.

Ocean energy systems.—The Committee provides $5,000,000 for ocean energy systems, the same as the House allowance and $1,500,000 over the budget request. The recommendation includes $500,000 for the PICHTR Center and an additional $1,000,000 for open-cycle experiments as proposed by the House.

Other solar programs.—The recommendation includes $13,632,000 for other solar activities, $500,000 more than the House allowance. This amount includes funds for program direction and support, technology transfer activities, and the International Solar Energy Program.

GEOTHERMAL

The Geothermal Research and Development Program is aimed at resolving technical problems that preclude the private sector from fully developing our vast geothermal resources. The Committee recommends $27,200,000 for geothermal activities, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request and $1,000,000 over the House allowance.

Hydrothermal industrialization.—The Committee includes $2,000,000 to continue a minimal effort in the hydrothermal area. These funds will assist States with significant hydrothermal resources to continue programs relating to resource assessment, resource development, technical assistance, and related activities. An amount of $320,000 is included for continuation of the National Geothermal Information Service and Technical Assistance Program.

The Committee recommendation includes $1,060,000 for building retrofit work and additional pipeline construction for the geothermal

district heating system operated by the city of Boise, ID. The Department is directed to promptly process the pending application made by the geothermal resource owners for renegotiation of the terms of their geothermal loan guaranty.

Geopressured resources.—The recommendation includes $3,600,000 for geopressured resources, the same as the budget request. This funding will continue analysis of long-duration flow test data from the design wells.

Geothermal technology.—The Committee recommends $20,800,000 for geothermal technology activities, the same as the budget request and the House allowance. The Committee concurs with the House proposal in support of the Salton Sea scientific drilling project.

The recommendation includes an additional $2,000,000 for hot dry rock research to restore the program to the 1985 funding level.

Due to the advances in hot dry rock research, the Committee believes it appropriate to endorse a project to demonstrate the commercial viability of the technology. Accordingly, the Committee includes $425,000 for a commercialization project in the southern Rocky Mountain area and directs the Department to proceed with a request for proposals.

HYDROPOWER

The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for small-scale hydropower, the same as the House allowance and the 1986 budget request.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

The Committee recommends $30,100,000 for energy storage and electric energy systems, the same as the House and $4,000,000 over the request.

Electric energy systems.—A total of $12,000,000 is provided for electric energy systems, which is $2,000,000 over the budget request and the same as the House allowance. The recommendation includes adequate funds for continued development of the Hawaiian deep-sea cable project.

Energy storage systems.—An amount of $18,100,000 is included for energy storage, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommends an additional $420,000 to continue activities on the zinc-bromine battery.

An additional $2,000,000 is provided for an expanded effort in electrochemistry research which will enhance the technology base for energy conversion and storage application as well as adding knowledge for hydrogen fuel production for use in future applications.

NUCLEAR FISSION

The Committee believes that nuclear fission remains an important option for meeting our electric energy requirements and for lessening the Nation's reliance on imported oil. The Committee continues to strongly support the Nuclear Fission Program.

The Committee does not support the House language on establishment of a peer review panel to select a single technology for further development. There are several different fission reactor technologies under development—liquid metal, advanced light water and modular high-temperature gas. Each of these systems has different capabilities and potentially may serve different purposes. All of these are being funded at different levels, and within the framework established by the House it would appear that a fair evaluation could not be made by the peer review panel during the next fiscal year.

A total of $631,925,000 is provided for the Nuclear Fission Reactor Program, $24,310,000 over the House and $25,650,000 below the budget request.

Light water reactor technology.—An amount of $45,300,000 is recommended for improved LWR technology, which is $2,000,000 below the House allowance.

For improved LWR development, the Committee provides $13,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 1986, which is $2,000,000 below the House level and $5,000,000 lower than fiscal year 1984. As requested by the administration, an additional $5,000,000 was allocated to the LOFT Program in fiscal year 1985 which lowers the requirement for LOFT by $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1986. Of the amount provided, $3,000,000 shall be available for the extended burnup program.

For Three Mile Island activities, a total of $32,300,000 is provided, the same as the budget request and House allowance. The Committee notes that the TMI Program is limited to necessary research and development only. Responsibility for the costs of TMI cleanup remains with the owner of the facility.

Converter reactor technology.—The Committee recommends $104,700,000 for advanced converter reactor technology, which is $500,000 below the House allowance and the budget request.

For advanced light water reactor, the recommendation includes $1,500,000, the same amount that is available in the current year. The increase proposed in the budget request was reduced until a report is submitted from the Department on the scope of the program including costs, the need to initiate this program in view of a similar effort sponsored by EPRI, and the status of commitments from industry on the level of cost sharing.

For high-temperature reactor technology, $32,000,000 is recommended, which is $6,000,000 over the House allowance. The development of this technology has been supported in the past because of its potential to serve special market areas and its potential advantages over the current light water reactor systems.

For liquid metal converter reactor, the recommendation provides $71,200,000, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

Advanced breeder reactor technology.—The Committee recommends $157,300,000 for breeder reactor technology, an increase of $16,000,000 over the budget request and $10,000,000 over the House allowance.

LOAN PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
ARIZONA					
AK-CHIN FARMS PROJECT-EAST	12,241,000	13,150,000	1,091,000	1,091,000	1,091,000
AK-CHIN FARMS PROJECT-PHASE 2	13,588,000	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
GILA RIVER FARMS SUPPLEMENTAL	6,683,000	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
ROOSEVELT IRRIGATION DISTRICT	10,515,000	10,415,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
CALIFORNIA					
COLUSA COUNTY WATER DISTRICT	9,640,000	5,173,000	3,467,000	3,467,000	3,467,000
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	25,720,000	15,920,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
LAKE ELSINORE STABILIZATION PROJECT	25,975,000	---	---	500,000	500,000
OAKDALE IRRIGATION DISTRICT	17,774,000	7,730,000	4,970,000	4,970,000	4,970,000
RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT (ESCALATION)	18,591,000	13,662,000	3,129,000	3,129,000	3,129,000
RAMONA MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	18,919,000	15,607,000	1,812,000	1,812,000	1,812,000
RANCHO IRRIGATION DISTRICT	20,940,000	---	---	100,000	100,000
SANTA ANA WATERSHED PROJECT AUTHORITY	14,714,000	---	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
UNITED WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT	18,227,000	---	---	2,500,000	---
YUBA COUNTY WATER AGENCY	18,180,000	2,324,000	8,400,000	8,400,000	8,400,000

LOAN PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
COLORADO					
AMITY MUTUAL IRRIGATION COMPANY	4,223,000	---	1,682,000	1,682,000	1,682,000
MONTANA					
EAST BENCH GRAVITY COMPANY	3,193,000	---	2,018,000	2,018,000	2,018,000
OREGON					
GALESVILLE PROJECT	24,301,000	19,950,000	4,351,000	4,351,000	4,351,000
TEXAS					
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO.1, SUPPL	12,972,000	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO.2 (SAN JUAN)	16,076,000	9,906,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
DELTA LAKE IRRIGATION DISTRICT	10,970,000	9,436,000	521,000	521,000	521,000

LOAN PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
WASHINGTON					
GREATER WENATEHEE IRRIGATION DISTRICT.....	6,560,000	---	---	---	1,500,000
VARIOUS					
CONSTRUCTION COST INCREASES.....	10,800,000	5,861,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
ADMINISTRATION OF LOAN PROGRAM.....	12,812,000	8,214,000	855,000	855,000	855,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	---	-5,481,000	-7,481,000	-9,681,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.....			41,415,000	42,515,000	39,315,000

For fuel performance and supply, the recommendation is $22,900,000, an increase of $7,000,000 over the House allowance. This increase is provided for the integral fast reactor concept to continue studies on fuel performance, pyrometallurgical process development, and related safety experiments.

For test facilities, the recommendation provides for $98,200,000, $6,000,000 over the House allowance and $12,000,000 over the budget request. The recommendation includes an additional $6,000,000 to maintain FFTF operations, fuel supply, and other technology programs at HEDL closer to the current level of operations. An additional $6,000,000 is provided to Argonne National Laboratory to help continue operations at EBR–II, HFEF, TREAT, and ZPPR, and for components and technology development programs, in support of advanced breeder concepts.

For nuclear fuel cycle, the Committee recommends $14,000,000, which is a reduction from the budget request but represents a $769,000 increase from the current year.

Civilian reactor development.—The Committee recommends $30,500,000 for these activities, the same as the budget request and $11,250,000 over the House allowance.

Advanced nuclear systems.—The Committee recommends $23,000,000 for advanced nuclear systems, an increase of $3,000,000 over the budget request and $3,000,000 below the House allowance.

The Committee includes $3,000,000 for the secure military powerplant project to initiate design studies on a compact nuclear reactor for potential use on military bases as an independent power source. The Committee is advised that the Department of the Air Force is interested in a joint project with the Department of Energy to evaluate the potential of these small reactors. Although the DOE requested no funding in fiscal year 1986, the Air Force indicates that there is an unspecified $3,000,000 in the Defense agency's budget for this program. Accordingly, the Committee provides $3,000,000 in order to more accurately determine the feasibility and the cost effectiveness of this project.

Defense nuclear energy programs.—The Committee recommendation includes funding for these activities within the Atomic Energy Defense Activities appropriation as proposed by the administration in the budget request.

Civilian waste.—The Committee recommends $20,725,000 for civilian waste research and development, which is $2,350,000 more than the House allowance and $2,650,000 below the budget request.

Remedial actions.—The recommendation of the Committee provides $225,000,000 for the Remedial Action Program, $25,000,000 over the House and $8,000,000 below the budget request.

For the Uranium Mill Tailings Program, the Committee trims the budget request by $10,000,000 for a total amount of $100,000,000, an increase of $38,010,000 from fiscal year 1985. The Committee believes that this amount of funding is adequate for the Department to remain on schedule for most, if not all sites and vicinity properties. Any neces-

sary stretchout in activities should be directed toward the planning and studies associated with sites which do not have completed remedial action plans.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

The Committee recommends $41,366,000 for environment, safety, and health activities, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommends $189,300,000 for biological and environmental research, $3,000,000 over the budget request.

For nuclear medicine programs, the recommendation provides for an increase of $3,000,000 because of the effectiveness that these programs have demonstrated. This is to be applied for continuation of research and treatment of brain and heart disorders through heavy ion therapy and other research and development.

MAGNETIC FUSION

The recommendation would provide $383,000,000 for the Magnetic Fusion Energy Research Program. This amount is $8,000,000 below the budget request and $3,000,000 less than the House allowance.

The goal of the revised magnetic fusion program plan is to establish the scientific and technological base required for fusion energy. Last year the Committee agreed that substantial changes in the magnetic fusion program were necessary. As a result of that action, the Department submitted a new program plan and strategy. The Committee generally agrees that the revised program plan submitted by the Department is responsive to the budgetary concerns and energy situation and conditions that led to the change of program emphasis in this complex research and development effort. Prior to this change, the magnetic fusion program was dedicated to the goal of a working fusion energy reactor system by the year 2000. The current effort and strategy is more oriented to a basic scientific research effort. The Committee concurs in the general reduction of $5,000,000 approved by the House, and recommends an additional $3,000,000 reduction to be applied from savings on lower priority activities.

The Committee provides $3,000,000 for the field reversed configuration experiment and reversed field pinch project. The Committee supports recent consideration within the Department to construct the proposed reversed field pinch project with an initial current performance of four magameres and, encourages that the design of the facility be kept flexible for the possibility of an even higher current experiment for the future. The Department should assure that this project eventually can be used as a generic test facility for other compact high power density devices as recommended by the panel of the Magnetic Fusion Advisory Council.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The budget request proposes $480,800,000 for supporting research and technical analysis including basic energy sciences. The Committee provides $502,300,000 for these activities, an increase of $21,500,000 over the budget request and $11,725,000 below the House.

Basic energy sciences.—A total of $438,300,000 is recommended for these activities, an increase of $28,500,000 above the budget request and $15,000,000 below the House.

For nuclear sciences, the Committee recommends $47,392,000, the same as the budget request and the House allowance. This is $3,792,000 more than the fiscal year 1985 funding level.

For material sciences, the Committee recommends $192,941,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request and $4,000,000 below the House allowance.

Project 86–R–300, the Center for Science and Technology, Atlanta University, the Committee recommends $4,500,000 to continue Federal assistance for this research center. In fiscal year 1985, the Department provided a grant for design of this facility. No funding request was included in the fiscal year 1986 budget. The Committee recommends funds to proceed with the facility and to assist in strengthening the participation of historically black colleges and universities in scientific research and manpower development pursuant to Executive Order 12320. It is the Committee's understanding that substantial non-Federal contributions will be committed to the project and that no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

Project 85–ER–133, the Advanced Science Center, University of Oregon, the Committee recommends $8,500,000 to continue Federal support for this advanced science and technology center. In fiscal year 1985, the Department provided a grant for design and related activities for the science facility under authority of Public Law 93–438 and Public Law 98–360. Although no funds were requested in fiscal year 1986, the Committee recommends funds and directs the Department to proceed with the facility. It is the Committee's understanding that the Department has thoroughly reviewed the project, that substantial non-Federal contributions will be committed to the project, and that no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

Project 84–ER–112, the Center for Advanced Materials, University of California, the Committee includes $14,440,000 to continue construction of this facility, which is $3,000,000 less than the budget request and $7,000,000 more than the House allowance. The Committee believes that establishment of a center for materials research with a strong technology focus and industry participation offers the potential for significant advances in this important field.

For applied mathematical science, the Committee recommends $37,590,000, which is $8,500,000 over the budget request and $8,000,000 below the House allowance. The recommendation includes $8,500,000 which will continue to fulfill the Federal share of an agreement with the Supercomputer Computational Research Institute at Florida State University.

For engineering and geoscience, the recommendation provides $32,175,000, which is $4,000,000 above the budget request and $4,000,000 below the House allowance. The Committee provides $4,000,000 above the budget request for the Energy and Mineral Research Center at the University of Alabama. This represents the initial Federal contribution to the facility and it is the Committee's understanding that no continuing operating funds will be requested or required and that substantial non-Federal contributions will be made in addition to the Federal share.

For biological energy research, the Committee recommends $19,015,000, the same amount as the House and $6,000,000 above the budget request.

Project 86–R–302, Center for Energy and Biomedical Technology, Tulane University, the Committee includes $6,000,000 above the budget request for this important facility. This represents the Federal contribution to this center and it is the Committee's understanding that no additional Federal funds will be requested or required, that no continuing operating funds are expected of the Federal Government, and that substantial private sector contributions will be made in addition to the Federal share.

University research support.—The Committee continues to be concerned over the continued use of highly enriched uranium at university research reactors. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission recently issued a rule for converting these reactors to low-enriched uranium [LEU]. The Committee is aware that a number of universities have converted or plan to convert to LEU. To further encourage these efforts, the Committee provides $3,900,000, an increase of $2,000,000 above the budget, for LEU fuel assistance to universities.

Multiprogram facilities.—The recommendation includes $42,200,000 for multiprogram lab facilities support, $9,000,000 below the budget request and $2,275,000 more than the House level. Due to fiscal constraints imposed in fiscal year 1986, the Committee recommends a general reduction to be applied against lower priority activities.

Cooperative programs.—The Committee supports the cooperative programs which enhance collaboration between the national laboratories and leading research universities. For years, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mendez Education Foundation, and Jackson State University have enjoyed a productive relationship intended to enhance computer science, scientific research, and academic programs at the institutions. The Committee is encouraged by the success of this effort, and the Department is directed to provide $1,500,000 from basic energy sciences in fiscal year 1986 to enhance and support this relationship.

The following tabulation shows the Committee's recommendation by program for new budget authority in comparison with the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
SOLAR ENERGY				
I. Solar applications				
A. Solar building energy systems				
Operating expenses	9,540,000	9,000,000	8,000,000	9,000,000
Capital equipment	200,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, Solar building energy systems	9,740,000	9,500,000	8,500,000	9,500,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems				
Operating expenses	46,105,000	43,600,000	44,600,000	47,800,000
Capital equipment	1,000,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Construction - (84-CE-001)	9,500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	56,605,000	44,800,000	45,800,000	49,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Solar thermal energy systems				
Operating expenses	34,720,000	28,100,000	25,100,000	28,100,000
Capital equipment	500,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	35,220,000	28,400,000	25,400,000	28,400,000
D. Biofuels energy systems				
Operating expenses	29,820,000	27,800,000	27,800,000	27,800,000
Capital equipment	1,000,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	30,820,000	28,400,000	28,400,000	28,400,000
E. Wind energy systems				
Operating expenses	15,680,000	20,000,000	8,000,000	27,000,000
MOD-5	13,000,000	---	12,000,000	---
Capital equipment	200,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	28,880,000	20,800,000	20,800,000	27,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Ocean energy systems				
Operating expenses	4,480,000	3,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Solar applications	165,745,000	135,400,000	133,900,000	148,100,000
(Operating expenses)	(153,345,000)	(132,000,000)	(130,500,000)	(144,700,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(12,400,000)	(3,400,000)	(3,400,000)	(3,400,000)
II. Other solar energy				
A. International solar energy program - DE	500,000	---	500,000	1,000,000
B. Solar technology transfer				
Operating expenses	6,000,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
D. Solar Energy Research Institute				
Capital equipment	---	261,000	261,000	261,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
General plant projects	---	2,071,000	2,071,000	2,071,000
Subtotal, Solar Energy Research Institute	---	2,332,000	2,332,000	2,332,000
F. Resource assessment				
Operating expenses	---	950,000	950,000	950,000
Capital equipment	---	50,000	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, Resource assessment	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
G. Program support - OE	1,000,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
H. Program direction - OE	4,766,000	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
Subtotal, Other solar energy	12,266,000	12,632,000	13,132,000	13,632,000
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY	178,011,000	148,032,000	147,032,000	161,732,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(165,611,000)	(142,250,000)	(141,250,000)	(155,950,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(12,400,000)	(5,782,000)	(5,782,000)	(5,782,000)
GEOTHERMAL				
I. Hydrothermal industrialization				
Operating expenses	990,000	- -	---	2,000,000
II. Geopressured resources				
Operating expenses	5,400,000	3,600,000	4,600,000	3,600,000
III. Geothermal technology development				
Operating expenses	24,029,000	20,300,000	20,300,000	20,300,000
Capital equipment	400,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	24,429,000	20,800,000	20,800,000	20,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
V. Program direction - OE	1,025,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	31,844,000	25,200,000	26,200,000	27,200,000
(Operating expenses)	(31,444,000)	(24,700,000)	(25,700,000)	(26,700,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(400,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)
HYDROPOWER				
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE	365,000	453,000	453,000	453,000
III. Program direction - OE	72,000	47,000	47,000	47,000
TOTAL, HYDROPOWER	437,000	500,000	500,000	500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE				
I. Electric energy systems				
A. Electric field effects research				
Operating expenses	4,700,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
B. Reliability research				
Operating expenses	4,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
C. System technology				
Operating expenses	10,683,000	3,630,000	5,630,000	5,630,000
Capital equipment	300,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, System technology	10,983,000	3,630,000	5,630,000	5,630,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction - OE.....	432,000	370,000	370,000	370,000
Subtotal, Electric energy systems.....	20,615,000	10,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
II. Energy Storage Systems				
A. Battery storage				
Operating expenses.....	16,259,000	12,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000
Capital equipment.....	500,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Battery storage.....	16,759,000	12,700,000	14,700,000	14,700,000
B. Thermal and mechanical storage				
Operating expenses.....	2,285,000	3,060,000	3,060,000	3,060,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Program direction - OE.....	453,000	340,000	340,000	340,000
Subtotal, Energy storage systems.....	19,497,000	16,100,000	18,100,000	18,100,000
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE.....	40,112,000	26,100,000	30,100,000	30,100,000
(Operating expenses).....	(39,312,000)	(25,900,000)	(29,900,000)	(29,900,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(800,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)
NUCLEAR				
I. Clinch River Breeder.....	---	---	---	---
II. Improved light water reactor technology				
A. Improved LWR development.....	19,691,000	21,000,000	15,000,000	13,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Three Mile Island R&D.....				
Operating expenses.....	29,150,000	32,300,000	32,300,000	32,300,000
Capital equipment.....	1,500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Three Mile Island R&D.....	30,650,000	32,300,000	32,300,000	32,300,000
Subtotal, Improved light water reactor tech.....	50,341,000	53,300,000	47,300,000	45,300,000
III. Advanced converter reactor technology				
A. Advanced light water reactor (LWR).....	1,500,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	1,500,000
B. Advanced high temperature gas reactor (HTGR)				
Operating expenses.....	31,058,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	31,000,000
Capital equipment.....	1,300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Advanced high temperature gas reactor..	32,358,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	32,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Liquid metal converter reactor				
Operating expenses	73,910,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000
Capital equipment	740,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Construction:				
86-N-101 Mods to reactors	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
85-N-600 GPP	800,000	---	---	---
78-6-E ETEC mods	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	800,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Liquid metal converter reactor	75,450,000	71,200,000	71,200,000	71,200,000
Subtotal, Advanced converter reactor tech	109,308,000	105,200,000	105,200,000	104,700,000
IV. Advanced breeder reactor technology				

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
A. Breeder component technology	14,000,000	6,700,000	6,700,000	6,700,000
B. Fuel performance and supply				
Operating expense	25,545,000	15,900,000	15,900,000	22,900,000
Capital equipment	11,425,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Fuel performance and supply	36,970,000	17,900,000	17,900,000	24,900,000
C. Reactor core technology				
Operating expenses	8,000,000	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
Capital equipment	1,165,000	2,320,000	2,320,000	2,320,000
Subtotal, Reactor core technology	9,165,000	7,220,000	7,220,000	7,220,000
D. Test facilities				
Operating expenses	91,240,000	86,200,000	92,200,000	98,200,000
Capital equipment	1,245,000	4,480,000	4,480,000	4,480,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
86-N-102 GPP	4,900,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
85-N-601 Mods to reactors, var. loc	1,000,000	---	---	---
84-N-102 Mods to reactors	---	---	---	---
78-6-C Safety research experimental facility, INEL, Idaho (A-E, Long-lead procurement and limited construction only)	---	---	---	---
78-6-E Liquid metal engineering center modifications, liquid metal engineering center, Santa Susana, California (A-E and long-lead procurement only)	---	---	---	---
78-6-F Fuels & materials examination facility, richland, WA	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	5,900,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Test facilities	98,385,000	92,480,000	98,480,000	104,480,000
E. Nuclear fuel cycle				
Operating expenses	12,391,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	14,000,000
Capital equipment	840,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Nuclear fuel cycle	13,231,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	14,000,000
Subtotal, Advanced breeder reactor technology	171,751,000	141,300,000	147,300,000	157,300,000
V. Water cooled breeder reactor technology				
A. Defueling	8,000,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
B. Core evaluation	17,970,000	14,600,000	14,600,000	14,600,000
Subtotal, Water cooled breeder reactor tech	25,970,000	19,700,000	19,700,000	19,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
VI. Civilian reactor development				
A. Reactor development generic support.....	9,714,000	11,250,000	---	5,250,000
B. Safeguards and security				
Operating expenses.....	5,100,000	5,750,000	5,750,000	5,750,000
Construction:				
85-N-602 ANL-WEST Phys. security upgrade.....	500,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
83-N-334 Safeguards & security improvements..	600,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	1,100,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
Subtotal, Safeguards and security.....	6,200,000	6,650,000	6,650,000	6,650,000
C. Reduced enrichment res. and test reactors.....	4,692,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction	9,010,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
Subtotal, Civilian reactor development	29,616,000	30,500,000	19,250,000	24,500,000
VII. Advanced nuclear systems				
A. Space and special applications				
Operating expenses	25,250,000	17,455,000	23,455,000	20,455,000
Capital equipment	1,500,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
Subtotal, Space and special applications	26,750,000	19,155,000	25,155,000	22,155,000
B. Program direction - OE	1,050,000	845,000	845,000	845,000
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	27,800,000	20,000,000	26,000,000	23,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
VIII. Defense nuclear energy program				
A. Space reactor project				
Operating Expenses	8,850,000	12,610,000	7,500,000	---
Construction:				
86-N-105 SP-100 facility modification, site undetermined	---	2,000,000	---	---
Subtotal, Space reactor project	8,850,000	14,610,000	7,500,000	---
B. Terrestrial applications	---	2,500,000	---	---
C. Program direction	---	390,000	290,000	---
D. Capital equipment	50,000	2,000,000	---	---
Subtotal, Defense nuclear energy system	8,900,000	19,500,000	7,790,000	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(8,850,000)	(15,500,000)	(7,790,000)	---
(Plant and Capital)	(50,000)	(4,000,000)	---	---
IX. Nuclear waste technology				
1. Low level waste				
Operating expenses	6,065,000	4,650,000	4,650,000	4,650,000
Capital equipment	150,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, Low level waste	6,215,000	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000
2. Waste treatment technology				
Operating expenses	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Capital equipment	300,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
Subtotal, Waste treatment technology	6,300,000	6,450,000	6,450,000	6,450,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
3. Civilian byproducts and beneficial uses....	---	---	5,000,000	---
4. Program direction - OE.....	485,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, Nuclear waste technology.....	13,000,000	11,700,000	16,700,000	11,700,000
X. Civilian waste R&D				
A. Spent Fuel Storage R & D				
Operating expenses.....	11,625,000	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
Capital equipment.....	1,000,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Subtotal, Spent fuel storage R & D.....	12,625,000	8,900,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
B. Alternative disposal concepts				
Operating expenses.....	9,975,000	10,500,000	5,500,000	9,500,000
Capital equipment.....	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Alternative disposal concepts.....	11,475,000	12,500,000	7,500,000	11,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Generic methods & supporting studies				
Operating expenses.....	2,021,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	---
E. Program direction.....	266,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
Subtotal, Civilian waste R&D.....	26,387,000	23,375,000	18,375,000	20,725,000
XI. Remedial actions				
1. Management of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities				
Operating expenses.....	29,380,000	38,850,000	33,850,000	38,850,000
Capital equipment.....	120,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, Management, of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities.....	29,500,000	39,000,000	34,000,000	39,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
2. Formerly utilized sites remedial action program				
Operating expenses	17,766,000	17,500,000	19,500,000	19,500,000
Capital equipment	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Formerly utilized sites remedial action program	17,966,000	17,700,000	19,700,000	19,700,000
3. Grand Junction remedial action OE	1,500,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
4. Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program				
Operating expenses	61,740,000	109,000,000	79,000,000	99,000,000
Capital equipment	250,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program	61,990,000	110,000,000	80,000,000	100,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
5. West Valley				
Operating expenses	47,900,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000
7. Program direction - OE	1,095,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
Subtotal, Remedial actions	159,951,000	233,000,000	200,000,000	225,000,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR	623,024,000	657,575,000	607,615,000	631,925,000
(Operating expenses)	(591,939,000)	(633,175,000)	(587,215,000)	(611,525,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(31,085,000)	(24,400,000)	(20,400,000)	(20,400,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH				
I. Environment, safety and health				
Operating expenses	38,174,000	39,866,000	39,866,000	39,866,000
Capital equipment	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	39,674,000	41,366,000	41,366,000	41,366,000
Addback of proposed rescission	373,000	---	---	---
Total, Environment safety and health	40,047,000	41,366,000	41,366,000	41,366,000
ENVIRONMENT R & D				
I. Biological and Environment Research				
Operating expenses	176,103,000	171,700,000	174,700,000	174,700,000
Capital equipment	7,936,000	7,750,000	7,750,000	7,750,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
86-R-120 GPP	3,000,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000
General reduction	---	---	-1,000,000	---
Subtotal, Biological and environ. research	187,039,000	182,700,000	184,700,000	185,700,000
II. Program direction - OE				
A. Bio and env. research - PD	3,450,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
Total, Environment R & D	190,489,000	186,300,000	188,300,000	189,300,000
(Operating expenses)	(179,553,000)	(175,300,000)	(178,300,000)	(178,300,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(10,936,000)	(11,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(11,000,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
FUSION				
I. Magnetic fusion				
A. Confinement systems				
Operating expenses	187,019,000	184,900,000	184,900,000	184,900,000
Capital equipment	16,700,000	15,100,000	15,100,000	15,100,000
Subtotal, Confinement systems	203,719,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000
B. Development and technology				
Operating expenses	67,900,000	62,500,000	62,500,000	62,500,000
Capital equipment	6,300,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Development and technology	74,200,000	67,500,000	67,500,000	67,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Applied plasma physics				
Operating expenses	82,491,000	78,100,000	78,100,000	78,100,000
Capital equipment	3,370,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
Subtotal, Applied plasma physics	85,861,000	84,500,000	84,500,000	84,500,000
D. Planning and projects				
Operating expenses	32,799,000	16,900,000	16,900,000	16,900,000
Capital equipment	3,800,000	3,950,000	3,950,000	3,950,000
Construction:				
86-R- GPP	9,400,000	9,108,000	9,108,000	9,108,000
78-3-A Mirror fusion test facility	20,100,000	4,042,000	4,042,000	4,042,000
78-3-B Fusion materials irradiation test facility, Hanford engineering lab,WA	3,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	32,500,000	13,150,000	13,150,000	13,150,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Planning and projects	69,099,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000
F. Program direction - OE	4,090,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
General reduction	---	---	-5,000,000	-8,000,000
Total, Fusion	436,969,000	390,000,000	385,000,000	382,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(374,299,000)	(346,400,000)	(341,400,000)	(338,400,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(62,670,000)	(43,600,000)	(43,600,000)	(43,600,000)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS				
I. Basic energy sciences				
A. Nuclear sciences				
Operating expenses	40,350,000	43,338,000	43,338,000	43,338,000
Capital equipment	2,950,000	2,754,000	2,754,000	2,754,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
86-R-401 A I P	300,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
86-R-400 GPP	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, Nuclear sciences	43,600,000	47,392,000	47,392,000	47,392,000
B. Materials sciences				
Operating expenses	133,055,000	138,496,000	145,496,000	138,496,000
Capital equipment	15,450,000	15,450,000	12,450,000	12,450,000
Construction:				
86-R-300 Atlanta University Center for Science and Technology	---	---	6,000,000	4,500,000
86-R-401 GPP	---	1,795,000	1,795,000	1,795,000
85-ER-401	1,800,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-ER-133 Advanced Science Center University of Oregon	---	---	---	8,500,000
84-ER-111 N S L S	10,000,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
84-ER-112 Center for advanced material	10,790,000	17,440,000	9,440,000	14,440,000
84-ER-113 SSRL enhancement	9,130,000	2,560,000	2,560,000	2,560,000
84-ER-114 Vitreous state laboratory	8,900,000	---	---	---
84-ER-115 Natl center for chemical research	3,000,000	---	12,000,000	3,000,000
84-ER-141 A I P	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	43,620,000	28,995,000	38,995,000	41,995,000
Subtotal, Materials sciences	192,125,000	182,941,000	196,941,000	192,941,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Chemical sciences				
Operating expenses	79,495,000	79,495,000	81,495,000	79,495,000
Capital equipment	8,840,000	8,840,000	8,840,000	8,840,000
Construction:				
86-R-400 GPP	3,750,000	3,930,000	3,930,000	3,930,000
85-ER-AIP	300,000	---	---	---
85-ER-403 Kansas State Univ	2,000,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Subtotal, Construction	6,050,000	5,830,000	5,830,000	5,830,000
Subtotal, Chemical sciences	94,385,000	94,165,000	96,165,000	94,165,000
D. Applied mathematical sciences				
Operating expenses	35,074,000	28,020,000	39,520,000	36,520,000
Capital equipment	1,500,000	1,070,000	1,070,000	1,070,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
Information Technologies	---	---	5,000,000	---
Subtotal, Applied mathematical sciences	36,574,000	29,090,000	45,590,000	37,590,000
E. Engineering and geosciences				
Operating expenses	26,675,000	26,675,000	26,675,000	26,675,000
Capital equipment	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Construction:				
86-R- Energy and mineral research center	---	---	8,000,000	4,000,000
Subtotal, Engineering and geosciences	28,175,000	28,175,000	36,175,000	32,175,000
F. Advanced energy projects				
Operating expenses	10,602,000	10,602,000	7,602,000	10,602,000
Capital equipment	320,000	320,000	320,000	320,000
Subtotal, Advanced energy projects	10,922,000	10,922,000	7,922,000	10,922,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
G. Biological energy research				
Operating expenses	12,455,000	12,455,000	12,455,000	12,455,000
Capital equipment	560,000	560,000	560,000	560,000
Construction:				
86-R302 Center for Energy and Biomedical Technology	---	---	6,000,000	6,000,000
Subtotal, Biological energy research	13,015,000	13,015,000	19,015,000	19,015,000
H. Program direction - OE	3,765,000	4,100,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	422,561,000	409,800,000	453,300,000	438,300,000
(Operating expenses)	(341,471,000)	(343,181,000)	(360,681,000)	(351,681,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(81,090,000)	(66,619,000)	(92,619,000)	(86,619,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Energy oversight, research analy. & Univ support				
A. Energy research analysis - OE				
1. Assessment projects	3,000,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
B. University research support - OE				
2. University reactor fuel assistance	3,892,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	3,900,000
3. University laboratory coop. program	6,550,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
5. Energy manpower assessment program	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
6. Education and training	300,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
General reduction	---	---	-1,000,000	---
Subtotal, University research support - OE	11,192,000	9,700,000	8,700,000	11,700,000
C. Advisory and oversight - OE	2,831,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. University research instrumentation.....	5,000,000	4,500,000	6,500,000	4,500,000
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, & Univ sup	22,023,000	19,800,000	20,800,000	21,800,000
III. Multi-program laboratories facilities support				
A. Multi-program general purpose facilities				
Construction:				
86-R-726 Fire protection improvements (BNL)..	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
85-R-701 Central chilled water facility (BNL)	2,200,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
85-R-702 Replace laboratory roofs (ANL).....	3,308,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
85-R-703 Electrical dist. system restoration	800,000	1,400,000	---	1,400,000
85-R-704 Rehabilitate underground steam syste	3,000,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-R-706 Medical facility (LLNL).....	500,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
85-R-707 Hanford site fire alarm system upgra	1,300,000	3,550,000	1,775,000	3,550,000
85-R-709 Central chilled water plant (ANL)...	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
85-R-711 Upgrade envir. monitoring system (OR	1,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
85-R-712 Central chilled water system restor	1,000,000	2,200,000	1,100,000	2,200,000
84-ER-101 Rehab. old utilities (LBL).....	3,750,000	---	---	---
84-ER-102 Cooling water facility, Restor. (ORNL).....	2,600,000	---	---	---
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)....	3,750,000	4,400,000	3,400,000	4,400,000
84-ER-104 Facilities support Projects (various locations).....	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-E-308 Rep power sys,INEL,LLNL,ORNL,RL.....	1,792,000	---	---	---
83-E-309 Electronics fac., ANL.....	3,150,000	---	---	---
83-E-310 Utility replacements.....	3,200,000	---	---	---
83-E-311 Emergency response center, ORNL.....	---	---	---	---
82-E-301 300 area utilities (HEDL).....	---	---	---	---
82-E-302 Security facility (ANL).....	1,100,000	---	---	---
82-E-305 Traffic safety improvements (HEDL)..	---	---	---	---
81-E-325 Energy Technology Lab (Sandia).....	---	---	---	---
80-ES-11 Idaho Lab Facility (INEL).....	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	33,200,000	29,300,000	24,025,000	29,300,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Environmental compliance				
Operating expenses	---	12,900,000	7,900,000	12,900,000
Capital equipment	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Construction:				
86-R-800 GPP	---	5,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
86-R-801 Nonradiological process waste treatm	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	8,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Subtotal, Environmental compliance	---	21,900,000	15,900,000	20,900,000
General reduction	---	---	---	-8,000,000
Subtotal, Multi-program lab facilitites support	33,200,000	51,200,000	39,925,000	42,200,000
(Operating expenses)	---	(12,900,000)	(7,900,000)	(12,900,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Plant and Capital).....	(33,200,000)	(38,300,000)	(32,025,000)	(37,300,000)
(General reduction).....	---	---	---	(-8,000,000)
IV. Small business innovation research program.....	---	---	---	---
Total, Supporting research and tech. analysis....	477,784,000	480,800,000	514,025,000	502,300,000
(Operating expenses).....	(363,494,000)	(375,881,000)	(389,381,000)	(386,381,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(114,290,000)	(104,919,000)	(124,644,000)	(123,919,000)
(General reduction).....	---	---	---	(-8,000,000)
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT				
I. Policy and Management				
A. Policy and management - OE - ER.....	530,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
B. Policy and management - OE - NE.....	1,473,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
D. Policy and management - CRE.....	1,492,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Policy and management - PSIE.....	785,000	798,000	798,000	798,000
Subtotal, Policy and management.....	4,280,000	4,898,000	4,898,000	4,898,000
ENERGY APPLICATIONS				
Technical Information & Management Program				
Operating expenses.....	12,616,000	9,200,000	9,200,000	9,200,000
Capital equipment.....	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, Technical Information & Management Prog	13,416,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
II. In-house energy management				
Operating expenses.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Construction:				
86-A-601 Modification for energy management..	---	15,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-A-602 Solid waste fired boiler (LANCL)....	---	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
86-A-603 Energy monitoring and control system	---	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
86-A-604 Waste heat recovery (INL).....	---	900,000	900,000	900,000
85-A-601 Mods for energy mgmt, various locati	10,000,000	---	---	---
85-A-602 Fuel storage facility, BNL.....	1,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
85-A-604 Combustion air preheaters, energy te	1,400,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
85-A-606 Cogeneration facility, BNL.....	1,600,000	10,600,000	---	10,600,000
84-A-602 Residual energy applications.....	---	---	---	---
82-A-603 LASL Hot water distribution.....	---	---	---	---

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM COSTS

Appropriations, 1985	$1,649,332,000
Budget estimate, 1986	1,612,700,000
House allowance	1,612,700,000
Committee recommendation	1,612,700,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

GROSS REVENUES

Appropriations, 1985	−$1,547,800,000
Budget estimate, 1986	−1,612,700,000
House allowance	−1,612,700,000
Committee recommendation	−1,612,700,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

This appropriation provides for expenses of the Department of Energy in connection with operating expenses, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other related incidental expenses necessary for uranium supply and enrichment activities. In this account, the revenues received from the enrichment of uranium are retained and used to offset costs incurred by the Department in providing uranium enrichment and other services.

The Committee recommends $1,612,700,000 for uranium supply and enrichment activities, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Committee recommendation for the Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities Program in fiscal year 1986 is the same as the President's budget request. The budget proposal assumes selection of AVLIS as the advanced enrichment technology in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of Energy to the Congress on June 5, 1985. The program recommended in fiscal year 1986 is the same as that contained in budget justification material submitted to the Congress. It is anticipated that a budget amendment will be submitted to the Congress to reflect current program plans.

The Department should assure that an orderly termination of AGC/GCEP activities occurs and, to the extent possible, take steps to provide for job retraining and placement, technology transfer, and documentation of centrifuge and centrifuge drive system research efforts.

The following table shows the Committee's recommendation by program:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
General reduction	---	---	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	14,000,000	33,400,000	7,800,000	23,400,000
Subtotal, In-house energy management	16,000,000	35,400,000	9,800,000	25,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(14,000,000)	(33,400,000)	(7,800,000)	(23,400,000)
III. Plant engineering and design				
Construction:				
82-C-601 Plant engineering and design	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Energy applications	29,416,000	45,400,000	19,800,000	35,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(14,616,000)	(11,200,000)	(11,200,000)	(11,200,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Plant and Capital).....	(14,800,000)	(34,200,000)	(8,600,000)	(24,200,000)
SUBTOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	2,052,413,000	2,006,171,000	1,964,836,000	2,006,721,000
(Operating expenses).....	(1,803,532,000)	(1,780,070,000)	(1,749,610,000)	(1,783,620,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(248,881,000)	(226,101,000)	(215,226,000)	(231,101,000)
Adjustments:				
Savings from management initiatives.....	-37,300,000	-17,000,000	-17,000,000	-17,000,000
FY83 deferral carried forward.....	---	---	---	---
Addback of proposed rescission.....	2,676,000	---	---	---
Use of prior year balances.....	---	-20,000,000	-217,400,000	-110,000,000
Use of PY balances (from UE).....	-60,000,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	1,957,789,000	1,969,171,000	1,730,436,000	1,879,721,000
(Operating expenses).....	(1,708,908,000)	(1,743,070,000)	(1,515,210,000)	(1,656,620,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(248,881,000)	(226,101,000)	(215,226,000)	(231,101,000)
(General reduction).....	---	---	---	(-8,000,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
URANIUM ENRICHMENT				
I. Uranium enrichment activities				
A. Gaseous diffusion and operations support				
Operating expenses	1,059,419,000	1,084,600,000	1,084,600,000	1,084,600,000
Capital equipment	11,000,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000
Construction:				
86-N-501 General plant projects	10,500,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
84-N-402 UF6 cylinders	---	---	---	---
84-N-403 Intermediate gas removal	3,000,000	---	---	---
84-N-404 Power systems protection impr	9,000,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
84-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase III	12,000,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-N-401 Rep. of elec. circuit breaker Gas dif. plant, Portsmouth, Ohio.....	---	---	---	---
83-N-402 Compli. with toxic sub. Control act, gas dif. plants.....	17,000,000	---	---	---
83-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase II, gas. dif. plant.....	700,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
82-R-412 Cooling tower mods.....	---	---	---	---
82-R-413 IMP UF6 containment.....	---	---	---	---
82-R-416 Env/safety mods.....	---	---	---	---
81-R-506 Environmental protection and safety improvements, Phase I GDP's.....	12,800,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	65,000,000	19,200,000	19,200,000	19,200,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion operations and suppo	1,135,419,000	1,118,300,000	1,118,300,000	1,118,300,000
B. Enrichment research and development				
1. Gas centrifuge operations and support				
Operating expenses	71,000,000	72,000,000	150,000,000	72,000,000
Capital equipment	1,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Gas Centrifuge	72,000,000	72,000,000	150,000,000	72,000,000
2. Atomic vapor laser isotope separation				
Operating expenses	69,800,000	69,800,000	---	69,800,000
Capital equipment	7,700,000	7,700,000	---	7,700,000
Construction:				
85-N-501 General plant projects, var. locs...	500,000	500,000	---	500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-N-407 Development I demonstration Module (design only)	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	500,000	500,000	---	500,000
Subtotal, Atomic vapor laser isotope separation	78,000,000	78,000,000	---	78,000,000
Subtotal, Enrichment R&D	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000
C. Gas centriuge enrichment plant				
Operating expenses	39,800,000	340,000,000	340,000,000	340,000,000
Capital equipment	200,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
76-8-G Enriched Uranium production facility, Portsmouth, OH	310,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Gas centrifuge enrichment plant	350,000,000	340,000,000	340,000,000	340,000,000

General Science and Research Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1985	$521,305,000
Budget estimate, 1986	545,800,000
House allowance	535,800,000
Committee recommendation	529,800,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−16,000,000
House allowance	−6,000,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1985	$208,700,000
Budget estimate, 1986	139,600,000
House allowance	149,600,000
Committee recommendation	149,600,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+10,000,000
House allowance	

The General Science Program is organized into interrelated scientific programs, high energy physics and nuclear physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near or mid-term, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization.

The Committee recommends $679,400,000 for general science and research activities, which is $6,000,000 below the House allowance and the budget request.

High energy physics.—The Committee recommends $520,100,000 for high energy physics, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request and the same as the House. The Committee has supported a 7-year program to upgrade Fermilab and the completion of the Stanford Linear Collider. These premier facilities are the highest energy fixed target and collider of their respective type in the world. The Committee is concerned that the detectors and equipment required to fully utilize the capabilities of the facilities cannot be accommodated from within the budget request. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation includes an additional $5,000,000 in capital equipment funds to maintain the equipment acquisition schedule.

Project 86–R–105, AGS proton-heavy ion booster, Brookhaven National Laboratory, the Committee includes $4,000,000 for the alternating gradient synchrotron facility upgrade. The Committee agrees that the addition of these funds does not represent a commitment of any kind to a larger high energy physics facility at BNL.

Nuclear physics.—The recommendation includes $172,900,000 for nuclear physics activities, the same level of funding as the House and the budget request.

The following tabulation shows the Committee recommendation for each program and activity:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction - OE.....	3,913,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
E. Advanced Tech. activities reserve.....	10,000,000	---	---	---
General reduction - OE.....	---	---	---	---
General reduction - CONST.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities.....	1,649,332,000	1,612,700,000	1,612,700,000	1,612,700,000
(Operating expenses).....	(1,253,932,000)	(1,570,800,000)	(1,579,000,000)	(1,570,800,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(395,400,000)	(41,900,000)	(33,700,000)	(41,900,000)
II. Uranium resource assessment				
A. Assessment program				
Operating expenses.....	---	---	---	---
Total, Uranium enrichment.....	1,649,332,000	1,612,700,000	1,612,700,000	1,612,700,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Offsetting revenues				
Operating expenses	-1,152,400,000	-1,579,000,000	-1,579,000,000	-1,579,000,000
Capital equipment	-19,900,000	-14,500,000	-14,500,000	-14,500,000
Construction	-375,500,000	-19,200,000	-19,200,000	-19,200,000
Subtotal, Total revenues	-1,547,800,000	-1,612,700,000	-1,612,700,000	-1,612,700,000
Addback of proposed rescission-(NE)UE	968,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT	102,500,000	---	---	---
(Operating expenses)	(1,254,900,000)	(1,570,800,000)	(1,579,000,000)	(1,570,800,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(395,400,000)	(41,900,000)	(33,700,000)	(41,900,000)
(Gross revenues)	(-1,547,800,000)	(-1,612,700,000)	(-1,612,700,000)	(-1,612,700,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH				
I. High energy physics				
A. Physics research				
Operating expenses	107,494,000	111,300,000	111,300,000	111,300,000
B. Facility operations				
Operating expenses	175,235,000	187,800,000	187,800,000	187,800,000
Capital equipment	54,800,000	59,200,000	69,200,000	65,200,000
Construction:				
86-R-102 AIP	10,000,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
86-R-103 GPP	10,200,000	10,400,000	10,400,000	10,400,000
86-R-104 Central computer (FERMI)	---	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
86-R-105 AGS Ion booster	---	---	---	4,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-ER-133 SLAC linear collider (SLC).....	60,500,000	22,900,000	22,900,000	22,900,000
82-E-206 Tevatron II.....	12,000,000	---	---	---
81-E-218 Tevatron I.....	21,300,000	8,600,000	8,600,000	8,600,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	114,000,000	55,500,000	55,500,000	59,500,000
Subtotal, Facility operations.....	344,035,000	302,500,000	312,500,000	312,500,000
C. High energy technology				
Operating expenses.....	90,200,000	92,400,000	92,400,000	92,400,000
D. Other capital equipment - CE.....	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
Subtotal, High energy physics.....	545,629,000	510,100,000	520,100,000	520,100,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(372,929,000)	(391,500,000)	(391,500,000)	(391,500,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(172,700,000)	(118,600,000)	(128,600,000)	(128,600,000)
II. Nuclear physics				
A. Medium energy physics				
Operating expenses	74,615,000	76,450,000	76,450,000	76,450,000
B. Heavy ion physics				
Operating expenses	49,448,000	52,650,000	52,650,000	52,650,000
C. Low energy nuclear physics				
Operating expenses	13,500,000	13,400,000	13,400,000	13,400,000
D. Nuclear theory				
Operating expenses	9,300,000	9,400,000	9,400,000	9,400,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Capital equipment	11,900,000	13,200,000	13,200,000	13,200,000
F. Construction:				
86-R-AIP	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
86-R-GPP	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
84-ER-110 Univ Accel upgrade	11,000,000	---	---	---
884-R-123 Tandem/AGS Heavy Ion transfer lines	5,300,000	---	---	---
Subtotal Construction	---	---	---	---
G. Other capital equipment - CE	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	182,863,000	172,900,000	172,900,000	172,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(146,863,000)	(151,900,000)	(151,900,000)	(151,900,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(36,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)

Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund

Appropriations, 1985	$327,669,000
Budget estimate, 1986	571,460,000
House allowance	521,460,000
Committee recommendation	552,460,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−19,000,000
House allowance	+31,000,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97–425) establishes the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund to finance activities related to development, construction, and operation of a commercial high-level waste repository and a proposal for a monitored retrievable storage [MRS] facility.

The fund is to be financed by fees paid by nuclear utilities. The budget request in fiscal year 1986 is $571,460,000. Revenues are used to meet required appropriations, with revenues in excess of requirements being retained in the fund as offsets to future needs.

The Committee continues to strongly support the program activities included in the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund. The recommendation provides $542,460,000, an increase of $31,000,000 over the House allowance and an increase of $224,791,000 or 69 percent over the current year. The Committee has imposed a relatively small general reduction to the program in view of overall budget constraints and the steep increases requested in the program. With prudent management, this reduction should not effect the priority activities of the program.

The Committee is aware that the States of Washington and Oregon are interested in a joint review of the proposed Hanford high level nuclear waste facility. Because the proposed Hanford site is on the Columbia River, which borders the State of Oregon for such a long distance and has such an important impact on commerce and industry of the State, the Committee is supportive of this joint approach. The Committee supports the State request for funds to contract with Oregon to study those issues which relate to the Columbia River.

Atomic Energy Defense Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1985	$5,672,720,000
Budget estimate, 1986	6,173,022,000
House allowance	6,009,637,000
Committee recommendation	6,037,022,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−136,000,000
House allowance	+27,385,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1985	$1,657,881,000
Budget estimate, 1986	1,854,378,000
House allowance	1,583,778,000
Committee recommendation	1,586,278,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−268,100,000
House allowance	+2,500,000

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $7,623,300,000 for atomic energy defense activities.

The appropriation recommended for atomic energy defense activities supports inertial confinement fusion, naval reactors development, the research, development, testing, production and stockpile maintenance for nuclear weapons, verification and control technology, special materials production, defense waste management and nuclear materials security and safeguards.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommends substantial increases in spending for the research, development, testing, production, and surveillance of nuclear weapons in order to meet national defense requirements. The budget includes funds for the production of eight nuclear weapons systems—the B61–3 and –4 bombs, the W76 warhead for the Trident, the W79 warhead for the artillery fired atomic projectile, the W80–0 warhead for the sea launched cruise missile, the W80–1 warhead for the air launched cruise missile, the B83 modern strategic bomb, the W84 warhead for the ground launched cruise missile, the W85 Pershing II missile warheads, and the W87 warhead for the MX missile.

Efforts are also underway in anticipation of future production of a number of additional warheads and bombs including the W88 warhead for the Trident II missile.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends $1,219,650,000 for research and development activities, an increase of $192,392,000 over the 1985 level and $8,000,000 above the budget request.

The recommendation for operating expenses includes $990,300,000 for an increase of about $40,000,000 over the fiscal year 1985 level and $70,000,000 over the budget request. Within the funds provided, $5,000,000 is included for construction and operation of the experimental halls for the weapons neutron research/proton storage ring at Los Alamos.

As proposed in the budget, the research and development activities include funding for inertial confinement fusion research. This change reflects the growing interplay between inertial fusion research and other nuclear weapons research, and also the increased utilization of inertial fusion facilities at the weapons laboratories for weapons research and development work.

The Committee is concerned that the level of operating funds proposed for inertial confinement fusion would be significantly less than required to make use of the large and expensive facilities recently con-

structed. These facilities have been expensive to build and offer promise if the experimental activities are continued. Accordingly, the Committee provides $155,000,000 for the ICF activities which is $85,000,000 over the budget request and the same as the House allowance. The recommendation includes $7,800,000 for Rochester, $13,800,000 for KMS, $33,000,000 for Los Alamos, $66,400,000 for Lawrence Livermore, and $24,500,000 for Sandia.

The DOE defense activities authorization bill, as passed the Senate, approved an authorization of $4,600,000 to upgrade and modify the Chroma laser operated by KMS in order to expedite experiments in inertial fusion, x ray laser, and weapons physics research in support of the Nova laser at Lawrence Livermore. Upon authorization or compliance with authorization requirements, the Department should reprogram or transfer funds from savings and slippages or lower priority efforts to carry out the upgrade and modification.

Project 86–D–101, general plant projects, the Committee recommends $20,200,000, the same as the House allowance.

Project 85–D–102, nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, various locations, the recommendation includes $35,600,000 to continue this effort at the current level of effort. The Committee notes that many of the activities included in this project were a part of project 84–D–107, nuclear test facilities revitalization, various locations.

Project 82–D–144, simulation technology laboratory, the Committee provides $10,300,000 and agrees with the request level in order to move toward completion in the most cost-effective manner.

Testing.—The Committee recommends $618,600,000 for testing activities which is $5,035,000 over the current funding level and $38,000,000 below the budget request.

For operating expenses, the recommendation includes $524,000,000, a reduction of $20,000,000 below the budget request.

Due to budget constraints, the Committee has reduced the funding for nuclear weapons testing. The Committee recognizes that this action may reduce by one the number of possible tests for fiscal year 1985. The Committee believes, however, that by increasing the number of experiments accomplished with each test, as the Department is doing, this reduction can be accommodated without major impact.

The Committee specifically includes $6,000,000 within the research, development, and testing allocation as requested in the budget for the Marshall Islands and related environmental programs. These activities are a legacy of the atmospheric nuclear testing conducted by Federal agencies from 1946 to 1958. Therefore, the Committee believes it is proper to include these activities within the budget request for defense programs.

Project 85–D–105, combined device assembly facility, the recommendation includes $24,000,000, an increase of $21,000,000 over the current level and $16,000,000 below the budget request.

Production and surveillance.—The Committee recommendation provides for $2,424,750,000 for production, surveillance, and maintenance of nuclear weapons, an increase of $100,918,000 over the fiscal year 1985 level of funding.

For operating expenses, the Committee includes $1,844,400,000 which is $38,118,000 above the current year level. Since the Department's testimony indicates that overall workload has not increased, the Committee concluded that the total increase requested was larger than necessary.

The Committee believes that with prudent management and through the full utilization of previously funded improvements in manufacturing technologies and equipment, the recommendation is adequate to maintain production schedules for all high priority systems including the cruise missile warheads, the Trident warhead, the modern strategic bomb, and the MX missile warhead. Full funding is included for preproduction activities for the Trident II warhead. The proposed reduction in operating funds also reflects and is consistent with the Committee action to again defer funding for the SM–2 warhead and the advanced ASW warhead and to end production of the W79 warhead.

For construction, the recommendation provides $444,050,000, which is $55,950,000 over the current funding level, and $26,600,000 below the House allowance. The Committee has deferred the initiation of facilities to begin production of the SM–2 missile warhead and the antisubmarine warhead. The Committee is not satisfied with the justification of need to begin facilities construction for these systems in fiscal year 1986.

The Committee recommendation provides the full budget request for Trident II warhead facilities.

Project 86–D–121, general plant projects, the Committee recommends $28,700,000, the same as the House, in lieu of the requested amount of $33,700,000.

Project 86–D–130, tritium loading facility replacement, the recommendation would defer initiation of construction on this project. The amount of $2,000,000 is included for completion of design to provide a better estimate of scope and total cost of the facility.

Project 84–D–112, Trident II warhead production facilities, the Committee provides $60,700,000, the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 1985 level.

Project 85–D–125, tactical bomb production facilities, the recommendation provides $9,000,000, a reduced level from the request pending a reassessment of our tactical nuclear bomb requirements as proposed by the authorization committee.

Project 84–D–113, antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead production facilities, the Committee defers any funding for this project in fiscal year 1986.

Project 84–D–118, high explosive subassembly facility, the recommendation includes $33,000,000 in lieu of the $40,000,000 proposed in the budget in anticipation of savings based on recent bidding experience for similar work at the plant.

Project 82–D–107, utilities and equipment restoration, the Committee provides $160,500,000 for phase III of this multiyear effort which is $5,000,000 less than allowed in the current fiscal year.

Project 82–D–109, 155 mm artillery fired atomic projectile, development of a new 155 mm nuclear projectile began in 1969 with the Army stating a need for a modernized artillery shell to replace the deployed W48. Development of the W74 warhead began that year and continued into 1973 when the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy terminated the program due to excessive cost and the use of obsolete technology. Requests to reinitiate the 155 mm development were denied by Congress in 1975 and 1976, but, in 1977, a new analysis of modernization requirements led to congressional authorization and appropriation of funds to reinitiate a research program.

The research development of the new projectile continued until 1979 when the Secretary of Defense directed a deep cut in the fiscal year 1981 budget request and then eliminated development funds in fiscal year 1982. Pursuant to the revised budget request, Congress approved further research and development engineering funds for the new 155 mm nuclear warhead, the W82, in fiscal year 1982.

The fiscal year 1983 and 1984 budget request proposed funding for production facilities and equipment for the W82, 155 mm artillery warhead. Citing the high costs of the warhead and the uncertainty of deployment, Congress did not provide any production funds for the W82 in fiscal year 1983 and 1984. No funds were requested for this project by the administration in fiscal year 1985.

This year in response to section 1635 of Public Law 98–525, the administration has submitted a plan which limits the production of the W82, the 155 mm artillery warheads and halts production in fiscal year 1986 of the W79, the 8-inch artillery fired atomic projectile warhead. Using 1978 constant dollars and excluding all indirect research, development, testing, production, and surveillance costs, the plan limits the production of these battlefield nuclear warheads to a total of 925 units within the total cost of $1,100,000,000. The plan also prohibits any further production of enhanced radiation warheads or ER components for either the W79 or the W82 warhead.

Due to the elimination of the ER portion of the program and as a result of the other restrictions imposed by Public Law 98–525, the total estimated costs of the W82 program have been substantially reduced and there is a greater likelihood of eventual deployment of the projectile. Accordingly, the Committee includes $15,000,000 for production facilities for the nonenhanced radiation W82, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

Project 82–D–111, interactive graphics system, the Committee provides $4,500,000, an increase of $1,600,000 over the fiscal year 1985 level.

Project 79–7–0, universal pilot plant, the Committee defers funding for this project which the Department has proposed to reduce in prior years in order to fund higher priority activities.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The Materials Production Program primarily provides the special nuclear materials used in the development, testing, and production of nuclear weapons. The Committee recommends increases to allow the Department to continue to operate necessary production reactors, processing facilities, and support facilities. The recommendation will continue the escalated efforts to restart the L reactor at the Savannah River plant, to produce additional quantities of weapon-grade material in the three operating Savannah River production reactors, to reactivate and operate the PUREX fuel processing facility at Hanford, and to operate the N reactor at Hanford for weapon-grade plutonium production.

The Committee recognizes that new initiatives may be necessary to meet the projected requirements for special nuclear materials. Nevertheless, the Committee is concerned that the Department has proposed several expensive initiatives that appear to provide only marginal supply contributions.

Because of the magnitude of the investment and lead times involved, the Department must give increased emphasis to long-term planning in the Materials Production Program.

The availability of special nuclear materials is influenced as much by recovery of materials from weapons being retired as it is influenced by the new production of such materials. Additional attention needs to be focused on the Retirement Program as well as all other alternatives for meeting special materials requirements.

The Committee recommendation for materials production totals $1,861,200,000 which is $116,000,000 below the budget request and $12,200,000 over the House allowance.

Reactor operations.—The Committee provides $565,380,000 for operating expenses for reactor operations, an increase of $29,839,000 over the 1985 funding level which allows for inflation increases over the current year. The increase from current levels of funding provides for operation of reactor feed plants at Fernald and Astabula, OH, and Oak Ridge, TN, the N reactor at Richland, WA, and four production reactors at Savannah River, SC.

Processing of nuclear materials.—The Committee recommends $509,645,000 for processing of nuclear materials which is $32,775,000 over the 1985 level of funding. For operating expenses, the Committee provides $478,145,000 which is $15,000,000 below the budget request but represents a $38,375,000 or 9-percent increase over the current year level. This allowance will provide for major processing activities at Richland, Savannah River, and Idaho Falls.

Project 86–D–148, special isotope separation plant, the Committee does not agree with the House allowance of $8,000,000 over the budget for design activities on the SIS plant. The Committee believes that the Department should perform a final review of the technologies before recommending either the process to be used or the site location of the facility. The Committee is concerned about the costs of the facility and urges the Department to place emphasis during the review on the most

cost effective and reliable technology available. Therefore, the Department shall review the technologies, recommend the appropriate process and site, and report to the Committees on Appropriations within 120 days after enactment of this act.

Supporting services.—The Committee recommendation for supporting services includes $395,075,000, an increase of $4,300,000 over the House allowance and $22,000,000 below the budget request.

For operating expenses, the Committee recommends $256,575,000, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

For construction, the recommendation provides $138,500,000 which is $4,300,000 more than the House and $22,000,000 below the budget request. Due to budget restraints, the Committee defers $22,000,000 for projects 86–D–149, productivity retention, and 82–D–124, restoration of production capabilities, allowing $50,100,000 for these activities.

Enriched material.—The Committee recommends $208,900,000 for enriched materials necessary for fuels for the production reactors and naval reactor cores whch is $50,000,000 below the request and $66,100,000 above the current year level.

Capital equipment.—The Committee recommends $121,440,000 for capital equipment, an increase of $4,581,000 over 1985 funding which provides for inflationary increases over fiscal year 1985.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Defense Waste and Byproducts Management Program includes near-term and longer term activities to assure that existing and future nuclear waste from Federal Government program activities can be isolated from the biosphere and pose no significant threat to public health and safety. For the near term, the wastes are managed through interim storage facilities. Simultaneous efforts are proceeding on development of technology and processes for long-term disposal.

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $666,000,000 for defense nuclear waste and byproducts activities, $49,000,000 below the budget request and $17,085,000 above the House allowance.

For operating expenses, $403,122,000 is provided, $2,000,000 below the budget request and is $15,085,000 above the House allowance. In conformance with the budget request, no funding is available in fiscal year 1986 for byproducts and beneficial uses activities.

For construction, the Committee recommends $262,878,000, $2,000,000 above the House allowance and $47,000,000 below the budget request.

Project 81–T–105, defense waste processing facility at Savannah River, the Committee agrees with the House reduction to the requested level in the budget and provides $165,000,000 for the project. This will provide for the continued construction of critical portions of the project and will require some stretchout of construction.

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The Naval Reactors Development Program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships.

The Committee recommendation includes $562,500,000, the same as the House, for the Naval Reactor Development Program which reflects a reduction of $6,500,000 in general plant projects, capital equipment funding, and modifications to the ATR. This will require the deferral of some activities to future years.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

This program provides for the research, development, testing, and support activities related to the detection of nuclear test activities in response to treaty verification and national security requirements; analysis and support for nuclear intelligence, export control and arms control issues; and the review of export licenses applications as required by the Atomic Energy Act as amended, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978, and the Export Administration Act of 1979.

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology provides $93,575,000, the same as the budget request and $3,600,000 over the House allowance. The total amount recommended represents a 22-percent increase from current year levels. The Committee, however, believes this increase is justified based on the important contributions made by these programs in the area of verification and arms control technology.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Committee includes $19,500,000 in support of a new decision unit proposed in the budget, defense nuclear energy programs. This amount is $12,000,000 over the House allowance and the same as requested in the budget. The recommendation includes $16,610,000 for space reactor technology (SP–100) and $2,500,000 for the North Warning power project.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $58,925,000 for nuclear materials security and safeguards development within this program, the same as the House allowance and $1,000,000 below the budget request.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

The recommendation includes $33,400,000 for security investigations, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendation, current year estimates, the budget request, and House allowance are shown in the following table:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. General Science program direction - OE.....	2,175,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH.....	730,667,000	685,400,000	695,400,000	695,400,000
(Operating expenses).....	(521,967,000)	(545,800,000)	(545,800,000)	(545,800,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(208,700,000)	(139,600,000)	(149,600,000)	(149,600,000)
Adjustments:				
Transfer of appropriation.....	---	---	-6,000,000	-6,000,000
General reduction.....	---	---	-4,000,000	-10,000,000
Addback of proposed of rescission.....	38,000	---	---	---
Savings from FY84 initiatives.....	-700,000	---	---	---
Total, Adjustments.....	-662,000	---	-10,000,000	-16,000,000
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH.....	730,005,000	685,400,000	685,400,000	679,400,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(521,305,000)	(545,800,000)	(535,800,000)	(529,800,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(208,700,000)	(139,600,000)	(149,600,000)	(149,600,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
I. Weapons activities				
A. Research and development				
1. Research and development				
Operating expenses	796,898,000	920,300,000	840,300,000	990,300,000
Capital equipment	78,660,000	91,450,000	86,450,000	91,450,000
Construction:				
86-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	19,000,000	22,200,000	20,200,000	20,200,000
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL	---	1,000,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
86-D-104 Strategic defenses facility, SNLA	---	8,000,000	---	4,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-105 Instrumenation systems lab, SNLA....	---	---	6,200,000	---
86-D-106 Laboratory Data Communications Center, LANL.....	---	---	---	3,000,000
85-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facs revitalization, Phase I, various locations.....	35,400,000	81,600,000	40,000,000	35,400,000
85-D-103 Safeguards and security enhancements, LLNL and SNLL	4,700,000	27,900,000	16,400,000	16,400,000
85-D-106 Hardened engineering test blds, LLNL	800,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
84-D-102 Radiation-hardened integrated circuit lab, SNLA	20,000,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000
84-D-103 Hardened central guard force facility, LANL, NM	5,600,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
84-D-104 Nuclear materials storage facility, LANL, NM	6,500,000	12,100,000	12,100,000	12,100,000
84-D-105 Safeguards and security upgrades, Phase I, LANL, NM	7,600,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
84-D-106 Security system upgrade, SNLA, NM	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
83-D-199 Buffer land acquisition, LLNL & SNLL	17,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	6,000,000
82-D-144 Simulation technology laboratory, SNLA	11,500,000	10,300,000	10,300,000	10,300,000
82-D-150 Weapons materials research and development facility, LLNL	16,800,000	---	---	---
82-D-152 New detonator facility, LANL	---	---	---	---
81-D-134 Earthquake damage restoration, SNLL, CA	4,900,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
78-16-G Radioactive liquid waste improvement, LANL, NM	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	151,700,000	199,900,000	145,700,000	137,900,000
Subtotal, Research and development	1,027,258,000	1,211,650,000	1,072,450,000	1,219,650,000
2. Testing				
Operating expenses	531,175,000	544,000,000	539,000,000	524,000,000
Capital equipment	43,790,000	50,000,000	45,000,000	50,000,000
Construction:				
86-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	7,500,000	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000
85-D-104 Test devices assembly buildings, LAN	800,000	---	---	---
85-D-105 Combined device assembly fac, NTS, NV	3,000,000	40,000,000	---	24,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-107 Nuclear testing facilities revitalization, various locations	21,900,000	14,900,000	12,900,000	12,900,000
84-D-108 Safeguards and site security upgrade, NTS, NV	5,400,000	---	---	---
Subtotal Construction	38,600,000	62,600,000	20,600,000	44,600,000
Subtotal, Testing	613,565,000	656,600,000	604,600,000	618,600,000
Subtotal, Research, development and testing	1,640,823,000	1,868,250,000	1,677,050,000	1,838,250,000
B. Inertial confinement fusion				
Operating expenses	154,750,000	---	145,000,000	---
Capital equipment	11,000,000	---	10,000,000	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
81-D-101 Particle beam fusion accelerator-II SNL, NM	3,500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	169,250,000	---	155,000,000	---
C. Production and surveillance				
Operating expenses	1,806,282,000	1,942,400,000	1,878,000,000	1,844,400,000
Capital equipment	119,400,000	136,300,000	125,300,000	136,300,000
Construction:				
86-D-121 General plant projects, various locations	27,100,000	33,700,000	28,700,000	28,700,000
86-D-122 Structural upgrade of existing plutonium facilities, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
86-D-123 Environmental hazards elimination, various locations	---	8,700,000	7,700,000	8,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-124 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Phase II, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	---	3,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
86-D-125 Safeguards and site security upgrade Phase II, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
86-D-130 Tritium loading facility replacement Savannah River, Aiken, SC	---	5,000,000	---	2,000,000
85-D-112 Enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	4,500,000	15,300,000	13,300,000	13,300,000
85-D-113 Plant power and steam dist system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	4,500,000	18,500,000	13,500,000	18,500,000
85-D-114 Safeguards vaults, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	3,100,000	---	---	---
85-D-115 Renovate plutonium building utility systems, Rocky Flats, CO	2,900,000	17,700,000	15,700,000	15,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-121 Air and water pollution control facs, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	5,000,000	14,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
85-D-122 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	2,700,000	---	---	---
85-D-123 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	1,000,000	4,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
85-D-124 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	1,000,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
85-D-125 Tactical bomb production facilities, various locations.....	5,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	9,000,000
84-D-112 TRIDENT II warhead production facilities, various locations	60,700,000	60,700,000	60,700,000	60,700,000
84-D-113 Antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead prod facs, var locations	---	16,000,000	10,000,000	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-114 Consolidated nonnuclear manufacturing facility, Rocky Flats, CO	18,100,000	---	---	---
84-D-115 Electrical system expansion, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	7,000,000	6,300,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
84-D-117 Inert assembly & test facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	6,700,000	5,400,000	5,400,000	5,400,000
84-D-118 High explosive subassembly facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	40,000,000	28,000,000	33,000,000
84-D-119 Railroad track replacement and upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	6,800,000	---	---	- -
84-D-120 Explosive component test facility, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	10,000,000	9,200,000	9,200,000	9,200,000
84-D-121 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Rocky Flats, CO	11,200,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-124 Environmental improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	17,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
84-D-211 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	8,000,000	15,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
84-D-212 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Pinellas Plant, FL	1,850,000	5,650,000	4,650,000	4,650,000
82-D-106 Weapon assembly facilities, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX.....	---	---	---	---
82-D-107 Utilities & equip restoration, replace & upgrade, Phase III, var locations..	165,000,000	195,500,000	170,500,000	160,500,000
82-D-108 Nuclear weapons stockpile improvement, various locations	---	---	---	---
82-D-109 155mm artillery fired atomic projectile (AFAP) prod facs, var locations ..	---	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-D-111 Interactive graphics system, various locations	2,900,000	8,500,000	6,500,000	4,500,000
82-D-146 Weapons prod & prod support facs, various locations	---	---	---	---
81-D-115 MX warhead prod facs, various locations	20,900,000	---	---	---
81-D-120 Control of effluents & pollutants, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	1,400,000	---	---	---
79-7-0 Universal pilot plant, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,800,000	15,600,000	10,600,000	---
Subtotal, Construction	398,150,000	547,650,000	470,650,000	444,050,000
Subtotal, Production and surveillance	2,323,832,000	2,626,350,000	2,473,950,000	2,424,750,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction				
Operating expenses				
1. Weapons program	50,453,000	49,855,000	49,855,000	49,855,000
3. Community assistance	13,266,000	48,845,000	48,845,000	48,845,000
Subtotal, Program direction	63,719,000	98,700,000	98,700,000	98,700,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities	4,197,624,000	4,593,300,000	4,404,700,000	4,361,700,000
(Operating expenses)	(3,352,824,000)	(3,505,400,000)	(3,501,000,000)	(3,457,400,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(844,800,000)	(1,087,900,000)	(903,700,000)	(904,300,000)
II. Materials production				
A. Reactor operations				
Operating expenses	535,541,000	586,380,000	559,380,000	565,380,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
86-D-150 In-core neutron monitoring system N-Reactor, Richland, WA	---	5,460,000	5,460,000	5,460,000
86-D-152 Reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, SC	---	4,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
85-D-136 Components protection system, 100-N area, Richland, WA	3,300,000	---	---	---
85-D-145 Fuel production facility, facility, Savannah River, SC (TEC-TBD)	5,800,000	20,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
84-D-136 Enriched uranium conversion facility modifications, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	4,400,000	14,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000
83-D-180 Facility storage modifications, various locations	6,500,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-D-146 Water pollution control, FMPC, Fernald, Ohio	4,100,000	---	---	---
82-D-126 Reactor safety and reliability, various locations	11,300,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
81-D-143 L-reactor upgrade, Savannah River, SC	15,000,000	---	---	---
Prior year projects	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	50,400,000	45,460,000	40,460,000	40,460,000
Subtotal, Reactor operations	585,941,000	631,840,000	599,840,000	605,840,000
B. Processing of nuclear materials				
Operating expenses	439,770,000	493,145,000	493,145,000	478,145,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
86-D-148 Special isotope separation plant (design only)	---	---	8,000,000	---
86-D-151 PUREX electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA	---	3,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
86-D-153 Additional line III tritium furnace, Savannah River, SC	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
86-D-154 Effluent treatment facility, Savannah River, SC	---	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
86-D-157 Hydrofluorination system, FB-Line, Savannah River, SC	---	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
85-D-137 Vault safety SNM inventory system, Richland, WA	2,500,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-130 Modification processing facility substations, Savannah River, SC	200,000	---	---	---
84-D-135 Process facility modifications, Richland, WA	10,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
83-D-142 Fuel dissolver off-gas transfer and treatment system, IFPF, INEL, ID	---	---	---	---
82-D-201 Special plutonium recovery facs, JB Line, Savannah River, SC	24,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
81-D-131 Remote analytical facility upgrade and expansion, IFPF, INEL, ID	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
80-AE-2 Replace obsolete processing facs., HB-Line, Savannah River, SC	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	37,100,000	31,500,000	38,500,000	30,500,000
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials	476,870,000	524,645,000	531,645,000	508,645,000
C. Supporting services				
Operating expenses	252,985,000	256,575,000	256,575,000	256,575,000
Construction:				
86-D-146 General plant projects, various Locations	29,500,000	34,800,000	30,500,000	34,800,000
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, Phase I, various locations	---	27,200,000	17,200,000	15,200,000
86-D-156 Plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, SC	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-132 Plant engineering and design	2,000,000	---	---	---
85-D-139 Fuel processing restoration, IFPF, INEL, ID	10,000,000	15,000,000	13,000,000	15,000,000
85-D-140 Productivity and radiological improvements, FMPC, Fernald, OH	3,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
84-D-134 Safeguards and security improvements Plant-wide, Savannah River, SC	13,450,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
84-D-137 Facility security systems upgrade, IFPF, INEL, ID	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
83-D-138 Purex canyon & dissolver filter systems improvements, Richland, WA.....	---	---	---	---
83-D-147 Pollution discharge elimination, Savannah River, SC.....	2,150,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC.....	9,500,000	8,600,000	8,600,000	8,600,000
82-D-118 N-reactor plant security and surveillance, Richland, WA.....	---	---	---	---
82-D-124 Restoration of production capabilities, Phase II, III, IV & V, var locs.	72,800,000	44,900,000	34,900,000	34,900,000
82-D-127 Safeguards improvements, Savannah River Plant, SC.....	6,700,000	---	---	---
82-D-128 Plant perimeter security systems upgrade, IFPF, INEL, IDAHO.....	400,000	---	---	---
82-D-136 Fuel processing facilities upgrade, IFPF, INEL, Idaho.....	1,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	155,500,000	160,500,000	134,200,000	138,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Supporting services	408,485,000	417,075,000	390,775,000	395,075,000
D. Enriched material	142,900,000	258,900,000	184,000,000	208,900,000
E. Capital equipment	116,859,000	123,440,000	121,440,000	121,440,000
F. Program direction	20,003,000	21,300,000	21,300,000	21,300,000
Subtotal, Materials production	1,750,958,000	1,977,200,000	1,849,000,000	1,861,200,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,391,099,000)	(1,616,300,000)	(1,514,400,000)	(1,530,300,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(359,859,000)	(360,900,000)	(334,600,000)	(330,900,000)
III. Defense waste and byproducts management				
A. Interim waste management				
Operating expenses	240,250,000	281,085,000	266,000,000	281,085,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
86-D-171 General plant projects, various locations	23,645,000	26,451,000	24,451,000	24,451,000
86-D-172 B-Plant F-Filter, Richland, WA	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
86-D-173 Central waste disposal facility, Oak Ridge, TN	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
86-D-174 Low-level waste processing and shipping system, FMPC, Fernald, OH	---	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
86-D-175 Security upgrade, ID	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
85-D-157 Seventh calcined solids storage facility, INEL, ID	7,000,000	14,500,000	12,500,000	14,500,000
85-D-158 Central warehouse upgrade, Richland, WA	700,000	5,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-159 New waste transfer facilities H-Area, Savannah River, SC	11,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
85-D-160 TRA security system upgrade, INEL, ID	2,000,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000
83-D-157 Additional radioactive waste storage facilities, Richland, WA	3,155,000	---	---	---
82-M-103 Waste handling & isolation facs, Richland, WA	9,700,000	2,180,000	2,180,000	2,180,000
82-M-107 Rail replacement/Hanford railroad, Richland, WA	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-T-104 Radioactive waste facs. improves., ORNL, Oak Ridge, TN	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	57,200,000	65,881,000	59,881,000	61,881,000
Subtotal, Interim waste management	297,450,000	346,966,000	325,881,000	342,966,000
B. Long-term waste management technology				
Operating expenses	90,400,000	96,567,000	94,567,000	94,567,000
Construction:				
81-T-105 Defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, SC	230,500,000	205,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000
Subtotal, Long-term waste management technology	320,900,000	301,567,000	259,567,000	259,567,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Terminal storage				
Operating expenses	25,800,000	25,070,000	25,070,000	25,070,000
Construction:				
77-13-F Waste isolation pilot plant, Delaware Basin, Southeast, NM	51,100,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Terminal storage	76,900,000	25,070,000	25,070,000	25,070,000
D. Byproducts and beneficial uses				
Operating expenses	---	---	---	---
Construction				
84-D-200 Byproducts beneficial uses coop demo plants, various locations	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Byproducts beneficial uses	---	---	---	---
D. Capital equipment	33,441,000	38,997,000	35,997,000	35,997,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Program direction	1,955,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Subtotal, Defense waste & by-products management	730,646,000	715,000,000	648,915,000	666,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(358,405,000)	(405,122,000)	(388,037,000)	(403,122,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(372,241,000)	(309,878,000)	(260,878,000)	(262,878,000)
All Other				
IV. Verification and control technology				
A. Verification and control technology				
Operating expenses	73,660,000	83,475,000	83,475,000	83,475,000
Capital equipment	2,000,000	5,600,000	2,000,000	5,600,000
Construction:				
85-D-171 Space science laboratory, LANL, NM	1,000,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	76,660,000	93,575,000	89,975,000	93,575,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(73,660,000)	(83,475,000)	(83,475,000)	(83,475,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(3,000,000)	(10,100,000)	(6,500,000)	(10,100,000)
V. Nuclear safeguards and security				
A. Nuclear safeguards and security				
Operating expenses	55,383,000	54,325,000	54,325,000	54,325,000
Capital equipment	4,700,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
Construction:				
86-D-186 Nuclear safeguards technology lab, LANL, NM	---	1,000,000	---	---
Subtotal Nuclear safeguards and security	60,083,000	59,925,000	58,925,000	58,925,000
VI. Security investigations - DE	34,000,000	33,400,000	33,400,000	33,400,000
Subtotal, All Other	170,743,000	186,900,000	182,300,000	185,900,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(163,043,000)	(171,200,000)	(171,200,000)	(171,200,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(7,700,000)	(15,700,000)	(11,100,000)	(14,700,000)
VII. Naval reactors development				
A. Plant development				
Operating expenses	63,900,000	66,000,000	66,000,000	66,000,000
B. Reactor development				
Operating expenses	229,300,000	261,300,000	261,300,000	261,300,000
Construction:				
86-N-101 General plant projects	2,000,000	7,500,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
86-N-104 Reactor modifications, ATR, INEL, ID	---	4,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
83-N-102 Additions to radioactive materials laboratory, Schenectady, NY	---	---	---	---

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1985	$349,034,000
Budget estimate, 1986	404,325,000
House allowance	400,039,000
Committee recommendation	400,039,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−4,286,000
House allowance	

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1985	$4,877,000
Budget estimate, 1986	10,327,000
House allowance	10,327,000
Committee recommendation	10,327,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $166,138,000 for departmental administration which is $4,286,000 below the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

The appropriation recommended for departmental administration supports the Department's general management, administrative, and program support functions not directly associated with program execution. The account provides for: (1) development and analysis of alternative energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of DOE programs; (2) the salaries, travel, and other costs associated with the management and support of DOE; (3) the Institutional Relations Program that provides information services and outreach activities focusing on the industrial, academic, and public communities, evaluation of energy-related inventions and support for energy training and education; (4) the performance of security investigations for persons with access to restricted atomic energy data; (5) development of international energy policy and international cooperatión in energy matters; and (6) revenues from the sale of DOE products and services and their related direct costs.

The Committee recommendations include an increase of $1,000,000 for a total of $2,300,000 for the Office of Minority Economic Impact. The Committee is concerned that the budget reduction proposed by the administration would have a significant adverse impact on the Department's program to enhance minority participation in energy programs.

The following tables show the Committee recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance.

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-N-111 Materials facility, Savannah River, SC	40,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
81-T-112 Mods. and additions to prototype facs, various locations	6,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	48,000,000	50,000,000	45,500,000	45,500,000
Subtotal, Reactor development	277,300,000	311,300,000	306,800,000	306,800,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation				
Operating expenses	122,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000
E. Capital equipment	22,500,000	30,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000
F. Program direction	11,200,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	11,700,000
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	496,900,000	569,000,000	562,500,000	562,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses).....	(426,400,000)	(489,000,000)	(489,000,000)	(489,000,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(70,500,000)	(80,000,000)	(73,500,000)	(73,500,000)
SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.....	7,346,871,000	8,041,400,000	7,647,415,000	7,637,300,000
(Operating expenses).....	(5,691,771,000)	(6,187,022,000)	(6,063,637,000)	(6,051,022,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(1,655,100,000)	(1,854,378,000)	(1,583,778,000)	(1,586,278,000)
Adjustments:				
Proposed recission (Sec 2901 P.L. 98-369) OE	5,499,000	---	---	---
Proposed recission (Sec 2901 P.L. 98-369) CE	2,781,000	---	---	---
Operating expenses.....	-10,550,000	---	-40,000,000	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Savings from management initiatives:				
Savings from management initiatives - AEDA (DE).....	-14,000,000	-14,000,000	-14,000,000	-14,000,000
Total, Adjustments.....	-16,270,000	-14,000,000	-54,000,000	-14,000,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.....	7,330,601,000	8,027,400,000	7,593,415,000	7,623,300,000
(Operating expenses).....	(5,672,720,000)	(6,173,022,000)	(6,009,637,000)	(6,037,022,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(1,657,881,000)	(1,854,378,000)	(1,583,778,000)	(1,586,278,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
I. Office of the Secretary - Salaries and expenses				
A. Office of the Secretary	1,051,000	1,146,000	1,146,000	1,146,000
B. Other expenses	547,000	497,000	497,000	497,000
Subtotal, Office of the Secretary	1,598,000	1,643,000	1,643,000	1,643,000
II. General management - salaries				
A. Board of Contract Appeals	273,000	281,000	281,000	281,000
B. General Counsel	7,268,000	7,171,000	7,171,000	7,171,000
C. Inspector General	7,184,000	7,144,000	7,144,000	7,144,000
D. A/S Management & Administration	36,647,000	37,725,000	37,725,000	37,725,000
E. A/S Cong., Intergov. & Public Affairs	2,869,000	3,587,000	3,587,000	3,587,000
F. Operations Offices	54,250,000	53,917,000	53,917,000	53,917,000
G. Policy, Planning & Analysis	1,925,000	2,372,000	2,372,000	2,372,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
H. A/S International Affairs	2,378,000	2,484,000	2,484,000	2,484,000
I. Office of Minority Economic Impact	450,000	438,000	438,000	438,000
Subtotal, Salaries	113,244,000	115,119,000	115,119,000	115,119,000
III. General management - other expenses				
A. Other salary expenses	7,189,000	7,455,000	7,455,000	7,455,000
B. Benefits	12,919,000	13,153,000	13,153,000	13,153,000
C. Travel	4,449,000	4,821,000	4,821,000	4,821,000
D. Services	116,866,000	121,589,000	119,589,000	119,589,000
E. Workmens compensation	1,582,000	1,436,000	1,436,000	1,436,000
F. Capital equipment	4,877,000	10,327,000	10,327,000	10,327,000
Subtotal, Other expenses	147,882,000	158,781,000	156,781,000	156,781,000
(Operating expenses)	(143,005,000)	(148,454,000)	(146,454,000)	(146,454,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(4,877,000)	(10,327,000)	(10,327,000)	(10,327,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Program Support				
A. Policy analysis and system studies	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
B. Indian Affairs	500,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
C. Consumer Affairs	80,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
D. Public Affairs	100,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
E. Competition	82,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
F. International Policy Studies	1,250,000	1,500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
G. Office of Minority Economic Impact	1,613,000	1,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
H. Cost of work for others	115,704,000	149,110,000	149,110,000	149,110,000
Subtotal, Program support	123,829,000	157,360,000	157,860,000	157,860,000
V. Miscellaneous revenues	-219,459,000	-244,228,000	-244,228,000	-244,228,000
FTE General reduction	---	-3,750,000	-3,750,000	-3,750,000
Savings from management initiatives - (MA)DA	-6,000,000	-6,000,000	-6,000,000	-6,000,000
Savings from FY84 initiatives	-375,000	---	---	---

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Section 302(a) of Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of electric power and energy from Falcon and Amistad Dams, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974. The act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, capital construction and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining Capital Program requirements.

RATE REFORM

The administration has proposed legislation with the fiscal year 1986 appropriation request that would provide for a significant increase in the rates charged by the power marketing administrations. The Committee has historically been a strong supporter for fiscal responsibility for the power marketing administrations and has supported and encouraged bringing costs under control and setting a foundation for rate stability.

The Committee is concerned that the proposed rate reform would have significant adverse impact on the economic health of the regions supported by the power marketing administrations and would result in less repayments to the Federal Government because of the loss of significant energy-intensive industries in the region. In addition, the proposed rate reform could result in a loss of jobs, increased unemployment assistance, loss of Federal taxes and ultimately a decrease in revenues to the Federal Treasury. The Committee has included bill language in the past preventing a change from a cost base to market base for PMA rates. This language was intended to prevent a unilateral change in the terms of agreements that were made years ago between the Federal Government and the regions served by the PMA's.

The Committee understands that the administration will make no changes in the rate development process administratively. The Committee concurs with the House committee directive that the rate structure not be modified without the enactment of appropriate legislation.

The following table summarizes the appropriations recommended for the power marketing administrations.

Alaska Power Administration

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1985	$3,233,000
Budget estimate, 1986	3,281,000
House allowance	3,281,000
Committee recommendation	3,281,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

An appropriation of $3,281,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

The Alaska Power Administration is responsible for operation, maintenance, and power marketing of two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska. The operating projects are the 30,000 kW Eklutna project near Anchorage and the 47,160 kW Snettisham project near Juneau. Project facilities include dams reservoirs, powerplants, transmissions systems, and necessary maintenance facilities. Power is marketed at wholesale to five Alaskan utilities. The project represents a current Federal investment of $127,000,000 and a replacement value in excess of $250,000,000.

The administration's fiscal year 1986 budget assumes that Alaska Power Administration programs and facilities will be transferred to the State of Alaska during fiscal year 1985. Such a transfer will require both Federal and State authorizing legislation. The Committee has been advised that legislation will not be enacted in time to implement the transfers prior to fiscal year 1986. Therefore, the Committee recommends funding the Alaska Power Administration in fiscal year 1986 at the fiscal year 1985 rate adjusted to reflect the completion of the Eklutna powerplant automation.

Bonneville Power Administration Fund

LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS

Appropriations, 1985	($40,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1986	(20,000,000)
House allowance	(20,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(20,000,000)
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

Bonneville Power Administration [BPA] is the Federal electric power marketing agency for the Federal Columbia River Power System [FCRPS], which consists of the hydroelectric generating facilities in the Pacific Northwest of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior (30 projects at present), plus BPA's transmission system of more than 14,000 circuit-miles of high-voltage transmission lines and 381 substations. BPA markets about one-half of the electric power produced in the Northwest and provides about four-fifths of the region's bulk electric power transmis-

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Addback of proposed rescission	2,786,000	---	-2,786,000	-2,786,000
Use of prior year balances	-29,053,000	-8,501,000	-8,501,000	-8,501,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	134,452,000	170,424,000	166,138,000	166,138,000
(Operating expenses)	(349,034,000)	(404,325,000)	(400,039,000)	(400,039,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(4,877,000)	(10,327,000)	(10,327,000)	(10,327,000)
(Miscellaneous revenues)	(-219,459,000)	(-244,228,000)	(-244,228,000)	(-244,228,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Alaska Power Administration				
A. Operating expenses	3,204,000	3,281,000	3,281,000	3,281,000
B. Emergency fund	---	---	---	---
Addback of proposed rescission	29,000	---	- -	---
TOTAL ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,233,000	3,281,000	3,281,000	3,281,000
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION				
I. Power marketing - Bonneville Administration	---	---	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(40,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)
TOTAL BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southeastern power administration				
A. Operating and maintenance	1,889,000	---	---	---
B. Purchase power and wheeling	33,840,000	---	---	---
Use of prior year balances	---	---	---	---
Addback of proposed rescission	15,000	---	---	---
TOTAL SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	35,744,000	---	---	---
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southwestern Power Administration				
A. Operation and maintenance	11,925,000	10,974,000	10,974,000	10,974,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	22,400,000	21,800,000	21,800,000	21,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Construction	3,700,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
Use of prior year balances	-7,060,000	-8,774,000	-8,774,000	-8,774,000
Addback of proposed rescission	243,000	- -	- -	---
TOTAL SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	31,208,000	29,500,000	29,500,000	29,500,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION - CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Western Area Power Administration				
A. Construction and rehabilitation	83,133,000	80,300,000	80,300,000	80,300,000
B. System operation and maintenance	74,665,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
C. Purchase power and wheeling	90,000,000	82,500,000	82,500,000	82,500,000
Unobligated balances	-30,000,000	-30,300,000	-30,300,000	-30,300,000
Addback of proposed rescission	432,000	---	- -	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Transfer from other accounts, permanent authority	---	-890,000	-890,000	-890,000
General reduction	---	---	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	218,230,000	206,610,000	196,610,000	196,610,000
EMERGENCY FUND - WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION				
I. Emergency fund	---	---	---	---
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMIN EMERGENCY FUND	---	---	---	---

sion capacity. Also, BPA markets and exchanges electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

BPA operates on a self-financing basis, thus requiring no appropriations. However, BPA's fiscal year 1986 budget reflects the need for additional borrowing authority of $301,000,000 to carry out the proposed program and new responsibilities pursuant to Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act.

The recommended limitation on direct loans is the same as recommended by the administration and the House. BPA indicates that this level is adequate to carry out its responsibilities as required by law.

Borrowing authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to BPA as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts BPA plans to use of this total and reports an estimate of Bonneville's borrowing requirements.

In addition to the cumulative $2,003,000,000 available to BPA through fiscal year 1985, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $301,000,000 in borrowing authority in fiscal year 1986 for the construction, conservation, and fish and wildlife programs for a total of $2,304,000,000, including any unused portion from prior years.

Conservation Program.—The Committee is concerned that the Conservation Program of BPA has been reduced to approximately one-half the fiscal year 1985 level. This level would seriously jeopardize the viability of conservation programs within the Bonneville service area. Therefore, the Committee provides BPA with $123,000,000 of additional borrowing authority to finance the Conservation Program. This level of additional funding, together with carryover funds from the current year and some financing through revenues, will be sufficient to carry out BPA's conservation responsibilities in fiscal year 1986.

The development of conservation capability in the industrial sector has been recognized as an important element in providing long-term electric load stability and in avoiding the construction of expensive thermal generation in the Pacific Northwest. For this reason, the Committee urges Bonneville to increase its efforts in the area of industrial load stability, looking at such options as industrial modernization, conservation, increased interruptibility, and variable rates to achieve this end, while at the same time seeking to assure that the lowest cost service is provided to all BPA ratepayers. Such options will help to maintain the economic viability of the aluminum industry, which is so vital to the Northwest region. The Committee commends BPA for the public policy and involvement process that was followed during the DSI options study.

Fish enhancement facilities.—BPA has announced support for revising the fiscal year 1986 budget to include five additional projects to enhance Northwest fisheries. These additional facilities were recommended by the Northwest Power Planning Council. The additional projects include two hatcheries, a rearing facility, and two projects that will open 200 miles of stream beds to salmon and steelhead runs in Washington and Idaho. BPA finances these activities from power sales.

The Committee recommendation includes bill language to allow for the construction of fish enhancement facilities and approves the required borrowing authority including not less than $300,000 for preliminary design studies for the Colville hatchery. The Committee has deferred action on the White River Falls fish passage project and has adjusted the requested borrowing authority accordingly.

Procurement restriction.—The House proposes bill language in both section 307 and section 506 which is designed to require certain Federal agencies including all the power marketing administrations, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Corps of Engineers to procure only high voltage power equipment produced in the United States. In other words, the House proposal would circumvent the competitive procurement practices currently imposed by Federal procurement statutes. The Committee strongly opposes inclusion of this far-reaching legislation in the appropriations bill. Although the full impact of the provision is not known, it could substantially increase Federal procurement costs in these Federal agencies. Accordingly, the Committee has deleted the House provisions.

With respect to the Bonneville Power Administration, the House proposal would remove management discretion and require changes in procurement statutes that BPA has operated under for 50 years. This dramatic change would significantly increase costs to BPA's electric ratepayers who finance all of its operations, decrease Pacific Northwest electric reliability, and probably delay or cancel current intertie expansion projects; thereby foregoing at least $80,000,000 per year in receipts and the further displacement of imported foreign oil and natural gas.

Transmission system.—The Committee understands that scheduling difficulties may occur in relation to timely completion of the dc terminal expansion project. It may not be possible for BPA and the participating utilities to complete all fiscal year 1985 procurement actions as originally scheduled. As indicated in last year's report, the Committee is highly supportive of this project and wishes it to proceed expeditiously.

Repayment.—The Committee is pleased with the efforts of the BPA to control costs and overcome the difficult energy problems in the Pacific Northwest. In fiscal year 1984, BPA paid the U.S. Treasury $648,900,000, including $217,600,000 of the deferred interest. At the end of fiscal year 1984, BPA was current in its payments of interest and amortization to the Treasury.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1985	$35,744,000
Budget estimate, 1986	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommendation concurs with the budget request and House action.

The Southeastern Power Administration [SEPA] markets hydroelectric power produced at Federal projects located in 10 Southeastern States in accordance with policy directives contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The States include Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi. There are 22 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,095,375 kilowatts.

Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through wheeling arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

The administration has not included a funding request for the Southeastern Power Administration [SEPA] in the fiscal 1986 budget. This reduced funding can be accomplished by funding the program with excess funds from fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985. The administration had assumed an elimination of the net billing arrangements with the operating utilities of the Southern Co., and the subsequent requirement to pay wheeling charges. Funding for wheeling charges was included in the budget request for fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985. Southeastern has recently completed negotiations which provides for a 7-year phase-in of sale to preference customers thus eliminating the need for wheeling expenses in fiscal year 1986.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1985	$31,208,000
Budget estimate, 1986	29,500,000
House allowance	29,500,000
Committee recommendation	29,500,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $29,500,000. This is the same as the budget request.

The Southwestern Power Administration [SWPA] is the marketing agent for the disposal of power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It is headquartered in Tulsa, OK, with an operation control center located in Springfield, MO, and maintenance crews and support warehouses located in Muskogee and Ada, OK; Jonesboro, AR; and Springfield, MO.

The SWPA provides transmission lines, substations, switching stations, and communication facilities for integration and optimal distribution of electricity from hydroelectric projects for transmission and sale of power to geographically dispersed customers.

The SWPA schedules and controls the generation of power from 23 hydroelectric projects. In addition, the SWPA operates and maintains 1,665 miles of transmission lines consisting of 161kV, 138kV and 69kV wood pole and steel construction. It performs maintenance on 20 radio and microwave stations, 34 switching stations and substations, with a total installed capacity of 2,070,400 kilowatts.

Western Area Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1985	$218,230,000
Budget estimate, 1986	206,610,000
House allowance	196,610,000
Committee recommendation	196,610,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−10,000,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $196,610,000, the same as the House allowance.

The Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance Program of the Western Area Power Administration [WAPA], excluding the Colorado River storage project and Fort Peck project, involves marketing federally generated hydroelectric power within a 15-State area in the West.

Western is responsible for the operation and maintenance of about 16,000 miles of transmission lines and over 200 substations. Electric power marketed by Western is generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission in Texas, all of which operate some 49 hydropower generating plants in Western's service area with a current installed generating capacity of 8,561,000 kilowatts.

As of the end of fiscal year 1984, the cumulative Federal investment in WAPA projects total $3,957,000,000. Of this, $1,527,000,000 has been repaid to the Treasury plus interest totaling $1,164,000,000 leaving, an unpaid investment of $2,447,000,000.

The Committee recommends bill language as requested by the administration to implement the provisions of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984. However, the bill language does establish a funding ceiling as provided for by the act at a level identified in the WAPA budget.

EMERGENCY FUND

The Committee recommends bill language as requested by the administration to establish a permanent emergency fund for WAPA. The Committee recommendation establishes a ceiling of $500,000 for the fund, which was used in fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1985	$97,100,000
Budget estimate, 1986	95,568,000
House allowance	93,068,000
Committee recommendation	95,568,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+2,500,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Revenues applied, 1985	$41,334,000
Budget estimate, 1986	66,077,000
House allowance	66,077,000
Committee recommendation	66,077,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1985	$55,766,000
Budget estimate, 1986	29,491,000
House allowance	26,991,000
Committee recommendation	29,491,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+2,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $95,568,000, the same as the budget request.

Section 204 and title IV of Public Law 95–91, the Department of Energy Organization Act, established within the Department of Energy the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out functions transferred from the Federal Power Commission for hydroelectric, electric utility, and natural gas regulation and from the Interstate Commerce Commission for oil pipeline regulation.

The act sets out the clear intent of Congress that the Commission be independent from supervision or direction from any other officer of the Department, but provides that the Secretary shall provide to the Commission such support and facilities as the Commission determines it needs to carry out its functions. This support includes services for personnel, accounting, facilities support, computer operations, procurement, and other similar services funded elsewhere in the Departmental request.

The following table summarizes the Committee action:

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

GEOTHERMAL LOAN GUARANTEE AND INTEREST ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1985	$121,000
Budget estimate, 1986	72,000
House allowance	72,000
Committee recommendation	72,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $72,000. This is the same as the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

The Geothermal Loan Guarantee and Interest Assistance Program is authorized under the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–410), as amended by the Department of Energy Act of 1978—Civilian Applications (Public Law 95–238).

The purpose of the program is to accelerate the commercial development and utilization of geothermal energy. Loan guarantees approved under this program are expected to achieve (1) development of normal borrower-lender relationships which, through experience, will encourage the flow of credit without further dependence on Federal financial assistance and (2) enhanced competition to encourage new contracts into the geothermal market.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1985	$151,300,000
Budget estimate, 1986	
House allowance	134,000,000
Committee recommendation	71,800,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+71,800,000
House allowance	−62,200,000

The Committee recommends $71,800,000 for Appalachian regional development activities, including salaries and expenses.

The Committee recommendation includes adjustments for application of prior-year deferred funds, and the phasing down of the Appalachian development programs. The action recommended also anticipates the 13 Appalachian States will assume a greater portion of the Commission's administrative budget as the Federal role is reduced.

In an effort to insure maximum effectiveness with the limited funds available, the Committee directs that not to exceed 30 percent of the total cost of an activity be financed with Federal dollars, except in distressed counties where the Federal share shall not exceed 50 percent. As in past years, the Committee expects only those projects and activities where funds can be expended within 1 year be intiated.

Inasmuch as there has been evidence in the economic indicators that the Appalachian region as a whole has come close to meeting the national average, a strategy to enhance economic development in struggling and distressed communities is desirable.

With the majority of new jobs being created by small businesses, the Committee would urge the Commission to focus its assistance efforts on measures designed to help local communities encourage the creation and growth of small businesses.

A policy to encourage entrepreneurship, innovation, and technological change at the State and local level is consistent with the national goal of raising productivity, improving U.S. competitiveness, and accelerating the rate of capital formation.

As in past years, the Committee cautions the Appalachian States that prefinancing is undertaken with no formal commitment of future reimbursement.

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1985	$172,000
Budget estimate, 1986	168,000
House allowance	168,000
Committee recommendation	168,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee concurs with the House allowance of $168,000, the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides the full budget estimate for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff in representing interests of the Federal Government in the Delaware River Basin Commission.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1985	$283,000
Budget estimate, 1986	275,000
House allowance	275,000
Committee recommendation	275,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $275,000, which is the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission.

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriations, 1985	$70,000
Budget estimate, 1986	
House allowance	79,000
Committee recommendation	79,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+79,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $79,000 for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the four States in the basin, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, plus the District of Columbia and Federal Government. The Commission has the responsibility for basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination and assistance.

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION				
I. Oil pipeline regulation	4,735,000	4,113,000	4,113,000	4,113,000
II. Natural gas regulation				
A. Pipeline certificate regulation	15,906,000	13,232,000	13,232,000	13,232,000
B. Pipeline rate regulation	18,092,000	16,684,000	16,684,000	16,684,000
C. Producer certificate regulation	2,306,000	2,080,000	2,080,000	2,080,000
D. Producer rate regulation	2,481,000	2,050,000	2,050,000	2,050,000
E. Wellhead pricing	7,332,000	6,090,000	6,090,000	6,090,000
Subtotal, Natural gas regulation	46,117,000	40,136,000	40,136,000	40,136,000
III. Hydropower regulation	25,194,000	30,705,000	30,705,000	30,705,000
IV. Electric power regulation	21,054,000	20,614,000	20,614,000	20,614,000
SUBTOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	97,100,000	95,568,000	95,568,000	95,568,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Adjustments:				
Addback of proposed rescission	204,000	---	---	---
General reduction	---	---	-2,500,000	---
Less pay cost suppl	-1,627,000	---	---	---
Less offsetting revenues	-41,334,000	-66,077,000	-66,077,000	-66,077,000
Total, adjustments	-42,757,000	-66,077,000	-68,577,000	-66,077,000
TOTAL, FERC AFTER REVENUES	54,343,000	29,491,000	26,991,000	29,491,000

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1985	$448,200,000
Budget estimate, 1986	429,000,000
House allowance	403,671,000
Committee recommendation	429,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+25,329,000

An appropriation of $429,000,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is $25,329,000 over the House allowance and the same as the budget request.

The Committee recognizes the critical importance of the Nuclear Regulatory Program, including the need to assure the protection of the public health and safety. The Committee is deeply concerned about the safety research activities which has been responsible for providing a sound, technical basis for regulatory decisions. The Committee believes a program of research program integration shows the promise of maintaining the focus of the research program. An amount of $12,000,000 of the restored funding is provided to implement and sustain the research program integration plan developed by NRC's Office of Research.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1985	$167,000
Budget estimate, 1986	163,000
House allowance	163,000
Committee recommendation	163,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends $163,000 for salaries and expenses of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, which is the same as the House allowance.

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 91–575) among the States of Maryland and New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government to enable them to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River and its tributaries.

This appropriation provides for the expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1985	$230,000
Budget estimate, 1986	230,000
House allowance	230,000
Committee recommendation	230,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $230,000 which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission. The amount recommended for the Federal contribution is $230,000 of a current expenses budget for 1986 of $1,483,000.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 1985	$120,000,000
Budget estimate, 1986	38,605,000
House allowance	109,000,000
Committee recommendation	90,861,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+52,256,000
House allowance	−18,139,000

The Committee recommendation for the Tennessee Valley Authority totals $99,861,000 including a new appropriation of $90,861,000.

The Committee has carefully reviewed the President's budget request of $38,605,000 for TVA's appropriated programs, a reduction of $81,395,000 below the level for the current year, and believes the proposed reductions go beyond what can reasonable be expected given the nature of the programs and activities involved.

TVA activities have and continues to provide many benefits to the Nation and the world. In the area of fertilizer development, three-fourths of the fertilizers made today are made with the aid of technology developed by TVA. Fertilizers developed by TVA are being used around the world to feed millions of people. TVA has also been a leader in the area of energy research demonstration as well as natural resource development.

Over the past several years, TVA has made concerted efforts to refocus and shift program priorities as resources have declined. But more can and should be done to be responsive to changing times and conditions. Greater effort must be placed on securing additional State, local, and private sector funding; and the Committee expects new and additional user fees to be instituted to recover more program costs.

North Alabama coal gasification plant.—In 1981 the administration and Congress agreed to support TVA's participation in development of a coal gasification demonstration plant. The agreement provided

$125,000,000 in appropriations for TVA to initiate the project. The remaining cost estimated at over $1,000,000,000 was to be financed by a consortium of private investors with possible help from the Synthetic Fuels Corporation [SFC]. The SFC, however, rejected all three of the consortium's applications for financial support.

The lack of SFC support and the drop in energy prices has made the project economically unviable. The consortium has concluded that it is no longer prudent to pursue the project, and the investors have withdrawn from a fourth SFC solicitation and from the project. As a result, TVA's Board of Directors voted to place the project in a defense energy reserve status to be reactivated if required by national security considerations. The site will be placed in an environmentally stable condition and reserved for the project in the event it is reactivated. The engineering work already accomplished will be placed in readily accessible files.

Of the original $125,000,000, $9,000,000 remains unobligated and deferred for use in 1986. The Committee recommendation applies these unobligated funds to other ongoing activities. TVA is to inform the Committee how these funds are to be reallocated within 30 days of enactment of this appropriations bill.

The following table shows the allocation of the funds recommended for activities under this heading:

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1985 program	1986 recommendation
CAPITAL INVESTMENT		
New lock at Pickwick Landing Dam	7,000	
Columbia Dam and Reservoir	2,210	
Dam safety modifications	5,000	8,800
Additions and improvements	4,932	2,900
Land and forest resources	223	323
Land Between the Lakes facilities	90	60
Economic resources	28	
Community resources	180	
Chemical facilities	6,079	6,400
Ammonia-from-coal facility	316	
North Alabama coal-to-methanol project	13,062	
General facilities	2,893	2,052
Total, capital investment	42,020	20,535
OPERATING EXPENSES		
Natural resources:		
Water resources	6,157	4,100
Reservoir system operations	21,675	16,176
Land and forest resources	4,873	3,350
Resource management and development support	2,610	2,133
Land Between the Lakes	7,160	5,900
Total, natural resources	42,475	31,659

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1985 program	1986 recommendation
OPERATING EXPENSES—Continued		
Economic and community resources:		
Economic resources	17,040	7,400
Community resources	5,461	2,975
Total, economic and community resources	22,501	10,375
Agricultural resources development	5,821	4,395
National fertilizer development:		
Fertilizer research and development	14,964	11,230
Fertilizer technology introduction	13,169	9,912
Ammonia from coal process	6,417	120
Hardwood fuels research	4,060	2,200
Total, national fertilizer development	38,610	23,462
General services	875	435
Total, operating expenses	110,282	70,326
Jobs bill (Public Law 98-8)	14	.....
Total, appropriations	152,316	90,861
Application of deferred unobligated coal gasification demonstration plant funds	.....	9,000
Total, program	152,316	99,861

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XVI, PARAGRAPH 7

Rule XVI, paragraph 7 of the Standing Rules of the Senate states:

"Every report on general appropriation bills filed by the Committee on Appropriations shall identify with particularity each recommended amendment which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The following items of appropriations recommended by the Committee, not made to carry out the provisions of existing law or an act passed by the Senate in this session, are brought to the attention of the Senate in accordance with rule XVI, paragraph 7.

On page 12, under Construction Program, an amendment is included providing appropriations for the Twin Falls Canal Co., for which there is no authorization.

On page 22, under energy supply, research, and development, the following language is included:

> *of which $18,500,000 shall be available only for construction of the Advanced Science Center, the Center for Energy and Biomedical Technology, and the Energy and Mineral Research Center as described in the report accompanying this Act; together with not to exceed $6,000,000, to be derived from revenues from activities of the Technical Information Services, which shall be credited to this account and used for necessary expenses and shall remain available until expended.*

On page 19, under general provisions, an amendment is included which establishes a working capital fund to assist in management of certain support activities of the Bureau of Reclamation.

On page 33, under Appalachian Regional Commission, included are appropriations for regional development programs and the highway system in the amount of $80,000,000 for which there is no authorization.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XXVI, PARAGRAPH 12

Rule XXVI, paragraph 12 of the Standing Rules of the Senate states:

"Whenever a committee reports a bill or a joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof it shall make a report thereon and shall include in such report or in an accompanying document (to be prepared by the staff of such committee) (a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment

and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee. This paragraph shall not apply to any such report in which it is stated that, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with the requirements of this subsection to expedite the business of the Senate."

The Committee recommends no such amendment.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1986: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development	NA	15,182	NA	[1] 15,630
Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1986				[2] 8,241
1987				4,901
1988				1,801
1989				223
1990 and future year				16
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1986 in the bill		72		4

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority and H.R. 2577 as passed the Senate.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1985	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1986	Increase or decrease
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY			
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$8,000,000	$8,000,000	
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation: Miscellaneous appropriations	350,000	350,000	
Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project		32,657,000	+$32,657,000
Department of Energy: Payments to States under Federal Power Act	570,000	570,000	
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow)	371,730,000	301,000,000	-55,730,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow)	435,110,000	403,354,000	-31,756,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	815,760,000	745,931,000	-54,829,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Rivers and harbors contributed funds	52,000,000	84,000,000	+32,000,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation trust funds	6,880,000	18,711,000	+11,831,000
Department of Energy: Advances for cooperative work	133,171,000	120,948,000	-12,223,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust fund accounts	3,700,000		-3,700,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds	195,751,000	223,659,000	+27,908,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1985 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1985 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
Department of the Army							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	138,000,000	119,000,000	133,189,000	120,697,000	-17,303,000	+1,697,000	-12,492,000
Construction, general	890,000,000	842,000,000	952,438,000	829,581,000	-60,419,000	-12,419,000	-122,857,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	10,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000
Revolving Fund	---	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000	-	---
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	321,000,000	269,000,000	321,685,000	285,735,000	-35,265,000	+16,735,000	-35,950,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,305,000,000	961,000,000	1,325,195,000	1,302,800,000	-2,200,000	+341,800,000	-22,395,000
General expenses	112,000,000	107,000,000	107,000,000	107,000,000	-5,000,000	---	---
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil: New budget (obligational) authority	2,791,000,000	2,330,000,000	2,871,507,000	2,662,813,000	-128,187,000	+332,813,000	-208,694,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Reclamation							
General investigations	35,566,000	32,050,000	34,085,000	32,150,000	-3,416,000	+100,000	-1,935,000
Construction program	740,000,000	532,430,000	541,074,000	512,730,000	-227,270,000	-19,700,000	-28,344,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1985 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1985 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Operation and maintenance	149,689,000	132,665,000	132,665,000	132,665,000	-17,024,000	---	---
Loan program	67,537,000	41,415,000	42,515,000	39,315,000	-28,222,000	-2,100,000	-3,200,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(68,500,000)	(40,000,000)	(41,100,000)	(37,900,000)	(-30,600,000)	(-2,100,000)	(-3,200,000)
General administrative expenses	58,917,000	49,200,000	49,200,000	49,200,000	-9,717,000	---	---
Emergency fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	1,052,709,000	788,760,000	800,539,000	767,060,000	-285,649,000	-21,700,000	-33,479,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior:							
New budget (obligational) authority	1,052,709,000	788,760,000	800,539,000	767,060,000	-285,649,000	-21,700,000	-33,479,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(68,500,000)	(40,000,000)	(41,100,000)	(37,900,000)	(-30,600,000)	(-2,100,000)	(-3,200,000)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,708,908,000	1,743,070,000	1,515,210,000	1,656,620,000	-52,288,000	-86,450,000	+141,410,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	248,881,000	226,101,000	215,226,000	231,101,000	-17,780,000	+5,000,000	+15,875,000
General reduction	---	---	---	-8,000,000	-8,000,000	-8,000,000	-8,000,000
Subtotal	1,957,789,000	1,969,171,000	1,730,436,000	1,879,721,000	-78,068,000	-89,450,000	+149,285,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,254,900,000	1,579,000,000	1,579,000,000	1,570,800,000	+315,900,000	-8,200,000	-8,200,000

Plant and Capital Equipment	395,400,000	33,700,000	33,700,000	41,900,000	-353,500,000	+8,200,000	+8,200,000
Subtotal	1,650,300,000	1,612,700,000	1,612,700,000	1,612,700,000	-37,600,000	---	---
Gross revenues	-1,547,800,000	-1,612,700,000	-1,612,700,000	-1,612,700,000	-64,900,000	---	---
Net appropriation	102,500,000	---	---	---	-102,500,000	---	---
General Science and Research Activities:							
Operating Expenses	521,305,000	545,800,000	535,800,000	529,800,000	+8,495,000	-16,000,000	-6,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	208,700,000	139,600,000	149,600,000	149,600,000	-59,100,000	+10,000,000	---
Subtotal	730,005,000	685,400,000	685,400,000	679,400,000	-50,603,000	-6,000,000	-6,000,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	327,669,000	571,460,000	521,460,000	552,460,000	+224,791,000	-19,000,000	+31,000,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activites:							
Operating Expenses	5,672,720,000	6,173,022,000	6,009,637,000	6,037,022,000	+364,302,000	-136,000,000	+27,385,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	1,657,881,000	1,854,378,000	1,583,778,000	1,586,278,000	-71,603,000	-268,100,000	+2,500,000
Subtotal	7,330,601,000	8,027,400,000	7,593,415,000	7,623,300,000	+292,699,000	-404,100,000	+29,885,000
Departaental Administration:							
Operating Expenses	349,034,000	404,325,000	400,039,000	400,039,000	+51,005,000	-4,286,000	---
Plant and Capital Equipment	4,877,000	10,327,000	10,327,000	10,327,000	+5,450,000	---	---
Subtotal	353,911,000	414,652,000	410,366,000	410,366,000	+56,455,000	-4,286,000	---
Miscellaneous revenues	-219,459,000	-244,228,000	-244,228,000	-244,228,000	-24,769,000	---	---
Net appropriation	134,452,000	170,424,000	166,138,000	166,138,000	+31,686,000	-4,286,000	---
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,233,000	3,281,000	3,281,000	3,281,000	+48,000	---	---
Bonneville Power Administration Fund:							
(Limitation on direct loans)	(40,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(-20,000,000)	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1985 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1985 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	35,744,000	---	---	---	-35,744,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	31,208,000	29,500,000	29,500,000	29,500,000	-1,708,000	---	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	218,230,000	206,610,000	196,610,000	196,610,000	-21,620,000	-10,000,000	---
(By transfer, permanent authority)	---	(890,000)	(890,000)	(890,000)	(+890,000)	---	---
Subtotal	288,415,000	239,391,000	229,391,000	229,391,000	-59,024,000	-10,000,000	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	95,677,000	95,568,000	93,068,000	95,568,000	-109,000	---	+2,500,000
Revenues Applied	-41,334,000	-66,077,000	-66,077,000	-66,077,000	-24,743,000	-	---
Subtotal	54,343,000	29,491,000	26,991,000	29,491,000	-24,852,000	---	+2,500,000
Geothermal Resources Development Fund							
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	121,000	72,000	72,000	72,000	-49,000	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy: New budget (obligational) authority	10,925,895,000	11,692,809,000	10,953,303,000	11,159,973,000	+234,078,000	-532,836,000	+206,670,000

Operating Expenses	(8,410,156,000)	(9,428,703,000)	(8,960,672,000)	(9,140,767,000)	(+730,611,000)	(-287,936,000)	(+180,095,000)
Plant and Capital Equipment	(2,515,739,000)	(2,264,106,000)	(1,992,631,000)	(2,019,206,000)	(-496,533,000)	(-244,900,000)	(+26,575,000)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission: Salaries and Expenses	2,300,000	---	---	---	-2,300,000	---	---
Funds Appropriated to the President:							
Appalachian regional development programs	49,000,000	---	44,000,000	81,800,000	+32,800,000	+81,800,000	+37,800,000
Prior year unobligated balance	---	---	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	---
Subtotal	49,000,000	---	34,000,000	71,800,000	+22,800,000	+71,800,000	+37,800,000
Appalachian highway system	100,000,000	---	100,000,000	---	-100,000,000	---	-100,000,000
Total, Funds Appropriated to the President	149,000,000	-	134,000,000	71,800,000	-77,200,000	+71,800,000	-62,200,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	172,000	168,000	168,000	168,000	-4,000	---	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	283,000	275,000	275,000	275,000	-8,000	---	---
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	455,000	443,000	443,000	443,000	-12,000	---	---
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:							
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	70,000	---	79,000	79,000	+9,000	+79,000	---
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	448,200,000	429,000,000	403,671,000	429,000,000	-19,200,000	---	+25,329,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	167,000	163,000	163,000	163,000	-4,000	---	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	230,000	230,000	230,000	230,000	---	---	---
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	397,000	393,000	393,000	393,000	-4,000	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1985 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1985 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Tennessee Valley Authority:							
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	129,547,000	38,605,000	118,000,000	99,861,000	-29,686,000	+61,256,000	-18,139,000
Prior year unobligated balance	---	---	-9,000,000	-9,000,000	-9,000,000	-9,000,000	---
Subtotal	129,547,000	38,605,000	109,000,000	90,861,000	-38,686,000	+52,256,000	-18,139,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies:							
New budget (obligational) authority	729,969,000	468,441,000	647,586,000	592,576,000	-137,393,000	+124,135,000	-55,010,000
Grand total, all titles:							
New budget (obligational) authority	15,499,573,000	15,280,010,000	15,272,935,000	15,182,422,000	-317,151,000	-97,588,000	-90,513,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(108,500,000)	(60,000,000)	(61,100,000)	(57,900,000)	(-50,600,000)	(-2,100,000)	(-3,200,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---	---